# EDUCATION IN AFRICA AND AMERICA: A HISTORY OF THE PHELPS-STOKES FUND, 1911-1945

by

Edward Henry Berman

Dissertation Committee:

Professor David G. Scanlon, Sponsor
Professor James H. Sheffield
Professor Marcia Wright

Approved by the Committee on the Degree of Doctor of Education
Date DEC 1 1969

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education in
Teachers College, Columbia University

1969

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages have small
and indistinct type.
Filmed as received.

University Microfilms

# EDUCATION IN AFRICA AND AMERICA: A HISTORY OF THE PHELPS-STOKES FUND, 1911-1945

by

Edward Henry Berman

Dissertation Committee:

Professor David G. Scanlon, Sponsor D.S
Professor James H. Sheffield
Professor Marcia Wright

Approved by the Committee on the Degree of Doctor of Education

Date DEC 1 1969

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education in
Teachers College, Columbia University

1969

# ABSTRACT

## EDUCATION IN AFRICA AND AMERICA: A HISTORY OF THE PHELPS-STOKES FUND, 1911-1945

Edward Henry Berman

In her will establishing the Phelps-Stokes Fund, which was incorporated in 1911, Caroline Phelps Stokes specified that the income from her bequest be used for the erection of tenement dwellings for the poor of New York City, as well as for educational work among North American Indians and Negroes in the United States and Africa. This study concentrates on the latter racial group.

The Phelps and Stokes families had long been active in charitable causes. The educational philosophy of the Fund was influenced by that of Hampton and Tuskegee Institutes, the Jeanes Fund, and the General Education Board. The Fund and its key personnel, Anson Phelps Stokes and Thomas Jesse Jones, were part of an interlocking directorate which profoundly influenced Negro educational policy in the United States.

Jones' 1917 survey of Negro education in America projected the Fund into the forefront of those groups concerned with the education of the "backward peoples." In 1919, with support from the influential Conference of British Missionary Societies and the British Colonial Office, Jones led a commission to survey the educational facilities and needs of West and South Africa. A sequel to East and Central

Africa followed in 1923. The key recommendations of both commissions emphasized the importance of simple agricultural and manual training for the mass of Africans who, it was assumed, would remain on the land indefinitely as colonial subjects. The Fund's critics, in America and abroad, charged that Jones' educational program, so similar to that followed at Tuskegee, would subordinate the African to white hegemony permanently, just as the American Negro had been subjected.

During the early 1920's the British Colonial Office became cognizant of the need for a common educational policy throughout its African dependencies. The recommendations of Jones' two Education Commissions seemed to fit this need, and in 1923 the British Advisory Committee on Native Education in Tropical Africa was created. The Advisory Committee's educational creed was largely that of the Phelps-Stokes Fund. Working in tandem with the Advisory Committee's personnel, Jones was instrumental in having Phelps-Stokes Fund educational policy accepted by various mission groups working in Africa. This was accomplished by a number of conferences in Britain and Europe.

In 1927 Olivia Egelson Phelps Stokes left a bequest to the Fund, with the stipulation that it help to raise a Tuskegee-in-Liberia. Until his retirement in 1945 Jones devoted much time and effort to the Booker Washington Agricultural and Industrial Institute; however, it was not a very successful venture for the Fund. Liberia's President felt that the lack of success could be attributed largely to the fact that the Fund and other American friends looked upon Liberia as they would a Negro community in the Southern United States.

The work of the Institute in Liberia is contrasted with the Fund's work in South Africa, in the field of race relations as well as in the educational sphere. It is noteworthy that the Fund was considerably more successful in South Africa, where it worked through the white establishment than in Liberia, where it worked through, and often around, the black establishment.

The study concludes that the Phelps-Stokes Fund, despite its apparent liberal orientation during the period under examination, was not as equalitarian as many had suspected, and that, in fact, if its educational policy had been implemented in Africa (it was not, largely because of strong African objections) the tide of African history would have been altered,-and not in the African's favor.

579

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have helped to bring this study to fruition. A glance at the bibliography will indicate the extent of my debt. I should like to express especial thanks to the trustees, officers, and staff of the Phelps-Stokes Fund who, besides providing office space and a research and travel grant, were unstinting in their many kindnesses and encouragement. To Miss Marjorie Ellmer, archivist of Edinburgh House, I should like to express my gratitude for her assistance as well as for the hot coffee she provided to ward off the English cold.

The members of my dissertation committee, Professors Scanlon, Sheffield, and Wright have read and criticized the manuscript at various stages and have given wise counsel, as has Professor Karl W. Bigelow. I am grateful to these and many others for their interest and help.

E.H.B.

# PREFACE

African educational history has, heretofore, been concerned almost exclusively with the contribution of missionary societies and governments.[1] Considering their dominant roles, this is not unnatural; however, this preoccupation has led to the neglect of a third agency--philanthropic organizations--involved in the education of Africans, although the contribution of philanthropy has been mentioned in several studies.[2]

The Phelps-Stokes Fund of New York played a role in American Negro and especially in African education disproportionate to the rather meagre financial resources it contributed directly to these endeavors between 1911, when it was incorporated, and 1945. The Fund's endowment of slightly less than $1,000,000 was small when compared with other philanthropic organizations established early in the twentieth century, e.g., the General Education Board was funded with $53,000,000 in 1901, and the Carnegie Corporation of New York with

---

[1] See, for example, J. F. Ade Ajayi, Christian Missions in Nigeria, 1841-1891: The Making of a New Elite (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1965); Robert I. Rotberg, Christian Missions and the Creation of Northern Rhodesia, 1880-1924 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965); Barbara Yates, "The Missions and Educational Development in Belgian Africa" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1967); and Felice Carter, "Education in Uganda, 1894-1945" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1967).

[2] See John Wilson, Education and Changing West African Culture (New York: Teachers College Press, 1963); and L. Gray Cowan, James O'Connell, and David G. Scanlon, eds., Education and Nation-Building in Africa (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965).

$135,000,000 in 1911. How could the small Phelps-Stokes Fund exercise such influence over the direction of Negro and African education despite its financial limitations? Was it due to a high degree of specialization, to the individuals who directed the Fund during the period under investigation, or to some extraneous factors? This study attempts to answer these questions, and to fill a void in the educational history not only of Africa but of America as well.

In her will establishing the Fund, Miss Caroline Phelps Stokes specified that the interest and not income of her bequest be used for the erection or improvement of tenement house dwellings for the poor of New York City, as well as for educational work among North American Indians and Negroes in both the United States and Africa. The decision to limit this study to the education of American Negroes and Africans is a reflection of my personal inclinations, although it could be shown that this was also the major interest of the officers and trustees of the Fund from 1911 to 1945. This is not to imply that the Phelps-Stokes Fund did not undertake valuable work in Indian education and housing for the needy of New York; these activities, however, will have to await future scrutiny.

The terminal date was chosen only after considerable debate; its rationale lay in the fact that it marked the retirement of the Fund's first Educational Director, and marked the effective retirement date of its most influential President. These individuals, more particularly the former, provided the continuity for the Fund's approach to its diverse programs in Africa and America and, consequently, their philosophies and backgrounds will be discussed in some detail.

Education for American Negroes and Africans was no less an emotional issue in the first third of the twentieth century than it is in the last third. Only the terms of reference have altered. One of the significant differences between the two eras is that today the black man has become, to some degree, the subject of his actions whereas sixty years ago he was the object. Even when he played this passive role, however, a debate raged over the question of whether or not education for the black man was a desirable goal from the viewpoint of the dominant white societies, in the United States and in colonial Africa.

Contemporaneous with the growth of American Progressivism and its humanitarian impulses in the early twentieth century was the era of the industrial magnates--Carnegie, Rockefeller, Mellon, Guggenheim, Rosenwald--who were to establish foundations which, it was hoped, would help to alleviate the poverty and suffering which have become identified with the Progressive Era. But while capital accumulation had left these men more financially secure than most, there were other, lesser endowed, families with similar humanitarian instincts which would find their outlets in social services and philanthropic foundations. The Stokes family of New York was one of these. Capital and a Christian conscience enabled the Stokeses to take an active interest in the plight of the world's underprivileged.

The Phelps-Stokes Fund was incorporated when Progressivism in education was coming into vogue in America. The Fund's Educational

Director was schooled in its tenets, and by adapting the Progressive theories to special circumstances the Fund was able to establish itself as a powerful force in the education of American Negroes and Africans. However, it is the thesis of this study that, despite the good intentions of its founder and many of its personnel, the Phelps-Stokes Fund--notwithstanding its liberal image--advocated the perpetuation of an educational caste system in America and later in Africa, which would not work to the ultimate advantage of blacks in either locale.

The Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, the numerous Rockefeller foundations are synonomous with American philanthropy; the Phelps-Stokes Fund is not. Yet its influence, especially in African education, was pervasive for the thirty-five years under examination. The Phelps-Stokes Fund, more than any single group, provided a link between educational theory in the Southern United States and British Africa, and it was the frequent equation of conditions in these two areas which led some people to question the Fund's motives.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . iii

Chapter

I. SETTING THE STAGE . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

Education in the South, 1800-1860 . . . . . . . . . . 1

First Concerted Efforts, 1860-1881 . . . . . . . . . . 9

The Beginning of Vocational Education . . . . . . . . 19

The Influence of Booker T. Washington . . . . . . . . 34

The Planning of Negro Education . . . . . . . . . . . 38

II. FIRST DAYS OF THE PHELPS-STOKES FUND . . . . . . . . . . 53

The Phelps and Stokes Families . . . . . . . . . . . . 53

The Phelps-Stokes Fund . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 58

Thomas Jesse Jones' Educational Philosophy . . . . . 69

III. NEGRO EDUCATION AND THE PHELPS-STOKES FUND . . . . . . 89

The Survey of Negro Education . . . . . . . . . . . . 89

Two Influential Friends . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 99

Influence at Southern Negro Schools . . . . . . . . . 104

Interracial Work . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 114

Two Negro Critics . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 117

IV. FIRST VENTURES IN AFRICAN EDUCATION . . . . . . . . . . 121

The First Education Commission . . . . . . . . . . . . 121

The Second Education Commission . . . . . . . . . . . 146

Aggrey of Africa . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 159

Chapter Page

V. THE FUND AND A BLACK REPUBLIC . . . . . . . . . . . . . 173

Early Interest in Liberia . . . . . . . . . . . . . 173

The Advisory Committee on Education in Liberia . . 180

The Booker Washington Agricultural and Industrial Institute . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 194

VI. THE FUND AND SOUTH AFRICA . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 230

First Contacts . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 230

Two Projects . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 236

Visits in the 1930's . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 248

VII. COLLABORATION FOR EDUCATION IN AFRICA . . . . . . . . 260

Toward a Unified Policy . . . . . . . . . . . . . 260

African Students in America . . . . . . . . . . . 279

VIII. CONCLUSIONS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 287

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 298

# CHAPTER I

# SETTING THE STAGE

## Education in the South, 1800-1860

By the time the Phelps-Stokes Fund was incorporated, the pattern of Negro education in the South was well established. Since the Fund neither advocated nor initiated a model for the education of Southern Negroes different from that which had evolved in the South after the Civil War, an examination of the growth and intentions of that institutionalized educational system will facilitate an understanding of the milieu in which the Fund would later work.

The invention of the cotton gin, the Industrial Revolution in England, the extension of the slave trade into the new American territories, and the persistence of this trade in the nineteenth century--despite British efforts to eliminate it--all had the effect of establishing slavery in the United States on a more permanent basis than ever before.[1] The years following the close of the war of 1812 witnessed a vast population movement westward from the Eastern seaboard. Into the Gulf region flocked settlers to clear and cultivate the fertile lands for the cotton crop. In the Mississippi-Alabama region alone there were approximately 40,000 settlers in 1810; ten years later this figure had jumped to 200,000, and by 1840 the white population reached almost one million.[1]

---

[1] Much of the following discussion is taken from John Hope Franklin, From Slavery to Freedom (3rd ed.; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), pp. 145-184.

Nor did the Negro slave population lag far behind these settler figures. In 1820 there were some 75,000 Negroes in this same Mississippi-Alabama region; by 1840 this number had increased to almost 500,000. Franklin asserts that "the increase of the white population, coupled with the tremendous growth of the Negro population, which consisted largely of slaves, is essentially the story of the emergence of the cotton kingdom."[2] Following the laws of economic logic, the demand for slaves increased in proportion to the growing prosperity of the region. Nor was this growing prosperity limited to the South alone.

The disruption of normal commercial activities of the European powers resulting from the Napoleonic Wars opened new horizons for Northern entrepreneurs. Trading and mercantile interests, hitherto New England's mainstay, began to give way to industrial developments. The embargo and the War of 1812 had acted as a prohibitive tariff on English manufacturers and, at the War's end, some of the younger and more farsighted men in New England saw the advantages of cotton manufacturing. Every country town with a good-sized brook or river set up a textile or paper mill. The center of interest in New England, and more particularly in Massachusetts, was shifting from the wharf to the waterfall.[1] Despite the fact that the slavery issue was instrumental in bringing on the cataclysm of 1861, it acted as no barrier to commercial partnership between North and South for some fifty years preceding that event. Except for a few, profits far outweighed conscience.

---

[1] Franklin, From Slavery to Freedom, pp. 171-172.

[2] Ibid., p. 172.

It is noteworthy that there was a remarkable concentration of the slave population in the hands of a relatively small group of people. The last census figures before the Civil War placed the slave population at 3,953,763 and noted that these were divided among a mere 384,884 owners. When this latter figure is seen against a total white population of approximately 8,000,000 in the South in 1860, it readily indicates that a great majority of the whites in the South had neither slaves nor an immediate economic interest in the maintenance of slavery as an institution or the plantation system.[2] And yet,

> the institution came to dominate the political and economic thinking of the entire South and to shape its social pattern for two principal reasons. The great majority of the staple crops was produced on plantations employing slave labor, thus giving owners an influence all out of proportion to their numbers. Then, there was the hope on the part of most of the non-slaveholders that they would some day become owners of slaves. Consequently, they took on the habits and patterns of thought of the slaveholders before they actually joined that select class.[3]

The political and social influence of the Southern Bourbons was hardly less than their economic predominence. Especially was this true of those relatively few who owned a considerable (and fifteen or more was considerable) number of slaves. This Southern aristocracy continued to dominate Southern economic, social, and political circles until after the Civil War. Only after the initiation of the Reconstruction Period did the Bourbons awaken to the challenge of the so-called poor whites, who saw the political and concomitant opportunities opening before them as a result of Reconstruction legislation. But by then the tide had turned against the aristocracy, and try valiantly though it did to revive and consolidate its former eminence, it was doomed to the role of spectator in the new political drama unravelling in the South. It is somewhat ironical that these aristocrats who, on the whole, accepted the facts of emancipation and enfranchisement of the former slaves and who were determined to make the best of the new situation imposed on the South, were powerless in the wake of the rise of the unpropertied whites and small farmers whose views and mannerisms were the antithesis of their own. Bond's comment, although perhaps overly generous, gives some idea of the position of the Bourbons during the post-Civil War period:

---

[1] Samuel Eliot Morison, The Maritime History of Massachusetts, 1783-1860 (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1921), p. 214.

[2] Franklin, From Slavery to Freedom, p. 186.

[3] Ibid.

> The sentiments of such [aristocratic] figures as Dr. J. L. M. Curry, Bishop Galloway, Atticus M. Haygood, General B. Gordon, and Wade Hampton were much in accordance with the plan of presidential reconstruction that was dimly suggested by Lincoln in his last writings and forwarded in some degree by his successor, Andrew Johnson. They represented the best tradition of the old southern "slavocracy": "large-hearted" gentlemen, in some degree more at home with their

> Negro slaves than with the unlettered and unpropertied whites of their own race.[1]

Public interest in education in the South until the Reconstruction Period was virtually non-existent. The traditions of that region, as well as the tax structure, the economic base, and the rural aspect, militated against any system of public education such as that which had crystallized in many Northern states by 1861. The responsibility for educating youth was largely a private one, and it can readily be understood why the Bourbons were not interested in fostering a system of public education. As long as they could afford to maintain tutors or send their children to private schools, they could rest assured that their political, social, and economic hegemony would not be challenged. But despite the obvious fact that this lack of public education affected the slaves most severely, it has been noted that "if the Negroes had been deprived of education, the dominant plantation oligarchy had likewise retarded the rise of free schools for the poorer sections where white people were a majority of the population."[2]

Although the poorer whites were also deprived of educational facilities there were no laws forbidding their education as there were to prohibit education of the slaves in the decades immediately preceding 1860. There was a time, however, as Dickerman points out,[1] when education for Negroes was more in honor among whites than in the years immediately before the Civil War. This, despite the fact that, "in the beginning there was no thought of educating the Negroes; yet the necessity to do so was always present."[2] Since the raison d'etre for slavery was economic--notwithstanding the psychological benefits which accrued to the owners--a complex system of slave labor was instituted on most plantations. And since all the slaves on a large plantation could not be utilized unless they were trained in ways which the system viewed as unsatisfactory, the training of slaves for certain specialized tasks became commonplace. Indeed, "by the opening of the nineteenth century, permissiveness had eroded the plantations society's rational policy [which forbade the teaching of slaves], and new educational opportunities had opened for a select group of slaves."[3]

---

[1] Horace Mann Bond, The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order (2nd ed.; New York: Octagon Books, 1967), pp. 17-18.

[2] Ibid., p. 19.

These educational opportunities were as often the results of sentimental attachments between masters and slaves as they were the results of an economic necessity which arose because of the self-sustaining nature of the plantations themselves. There was a small grain of truth in Booker T. Washington's assertion that "in a certain way, every slave plantation in the South was an industrial school. . . ."[1] Many favored slaves felt that the ability to read and write made them the "quality people" with whom they identified and, consequently, they used all the available opportunities to become literate that the informal system afforded them. Whether the vehicle of transmission was the "play school" that grew out of the social relations maintained with the owner's children or the necessity for a house servant to distinguish between the various newspapers his master ordered him to select, the result was invariably the same--education became a built-in factor for select slaves on the plantations.[2]

---

[1] George Dickerman, "The History of Negro Education," in Negro Education, A Survey of the Private and Higher Schools for Colored People in the United States, Thomas Jesse Jones (2 vols.; Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1917), II, 243-268.

[2] Henry Allen Bullock, A History of Negro Education in the South from 1619 to the Present (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), p. 1.

[3] Ibid., p. 7.

But the approach of the Civil War and the spread of anti-slavery literature made the official camp of the plantation order oppose this permissive attitude in the education of slaves. When the attack became more virulent, the practice of teaching slaves to read and write merely moved underground. The more stringent laws prohibiting the assembly and teaching of slaves were passed between 1830 and 1835, and must be seen as a response to the risings of Toussaint L'Ouverture in Haiti during the last years of the eighteenth century, of Denmark Vesey in South Carolina in 1822, and of Nat Turner in Virginia in 1831. With the teaching of slaves under a ban, an intelligent Negro became the object of suspicion and it was not politic for one to be known as able to read and write.[1] The proportion of slaves receiving some form of education was very small indeed, and it should be borne in mind that the educational opportunities which developed around the plantations before the Civil War "were neither available to all the slaves nor firmly established as an acceptable part of the official Southern society. They were privileges gained principally by household servants still under the slave regime or by the free Negroes who had escaped it."[2]

---

[1] Booker T. Washington, "Industrial Education for the Negro," in The Negro Problem, W. E. B. DuBois (New York: James Pott and Company, 1903), p. 11.

[2] Bullock, A History of Negro Education, pp. 9-10. See also Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma (New York: McGraw-Hill edition, 1964), II, 887.

It is hardly surprising that out of this indulgence and stealth there developed a greater trend toward freedom and leadership that would keep the trend alive, to be sure not always in great force. But the heaviest blow that Negroes struck against slavery surely came from those slaves who had been educated in bondage and who, having escaped North, joined the anti-slavery movements. William Wells Brown, Thomas H. Jones, and Frederick Douglass are only three of those who acquired their educations in slavery and later cranked the propaganda machine against the institution.[3]

Despite these few glimmers of educational hope in the Negro South prior to the Civil War, the outlook was rather bleak. The education of slaves was banned by legislation in all states of the Confederacy, although some individuals did imbibe the rudiments of an elementary education, either through the efforts of an interested master or surreptitiously;[1] a small number of free Negroes, in both North and South, were enrolled in schools[2] and were thus able to hold out a beacon of light; and there existed, with the exception of a few cities, no facilities for public education for either race in the South.

---

[1] Dickerman, "The History of Negro Education," p. 246.

[2] Bullock, A History of Negro Education, p. 13.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 13-15.

## First Concerted Efforts, 1860-1881

Long before the shooting ceased, plans were being laid for the education of the freedmen. Shortly after General W. T. Sherman issued a declaration from Hilton Head, advising that the condition of the black refugees in the vast area of his command called for immediate action, the first society established primarily for the education and aid of the freedmen was founded. Organized in Boston in February, 1862, the Boston Educational Commission, later called the New England

---

[1] Franklin, From Slavery to Freedom, p. 202, notes, however, that schools for Negroes did exist at various times in the following cities: Savannah, Charleston, Fayetteville, Louisville, and Norfolk. The case of Frederick Douglass having been taught by his mistress is perhaps the best known instance of an owner teaching a slave.

[2] Franklin, From Slavery to Freedom, pp. 229-230, points out that many Northern cities maintained separate public schools for Negroes, although Boston permitted Negro children to attend white schools in 1855. There were 1,400 free Negro children in school in Baltimore and 1,000 in New Orleans in 1850. In the states and territories as a whole, Franklin estimates that there were approximately 32,500 Negroes in school in 1860. This figure should be viewed in the perspective of the 1800 census, which numbered the Negro slave population alone at 3,953,760. To this number can be added Bullock's estimate of 258,346 free Negroes in the South in 1860, and an undetermined number of free Negroes in the North.

Freedmen's Aid Society, had as its purpose the effecting of the industrial, social, intellectual, and moral improvement of the blacks.[1] This society was the forerunner of similar organizations founded in New York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, and Louisville. During the next year a confederation of the five leading societies was formed and its first meeting took place in Washington, D.C. in February, 1864. This organization, in turn, was displaced in March, 1865, by the American Freedmen's Aid Union, which was composed of the New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore societies. This Union aimed to assist the freedman in his struggle by the following measures: physical relief, rudimentary schooling, and the support of all measures and institutions that aimed at elevating his status.[2]

The fractured nature of the efforts of these various societies--all motivated by worthy ideals, but sorely lacking in any semblance of administrative cohesion--sharpened the public awareness of the problem and was partly responsible for forcing the Union government to revise the programs' structures and harness their functions. The report of the Freedmen's Inquiry Commission to the Secretary of War in June, 1863, brutally exposed the inadequacies of the existing relief mechanisms. Accordingly, after almost two years of wrangling, Congress established, in March, 1865, the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen and Abandoned Lands or, more simply, the Freedmen's Bureau. Under the direction of General Oliver Otis Howard, the Freedmen's Bureau undertook to resettle many people displaced by the war, to protect the Negro in his freedom to choose his employer and to work for a fair wage, and to forge ahead in the field of education for the freedman.[1] Franklin asserts that it was in education that the Bureau achieved its greatest success. It established and supervised all kinds of schools; day, night, Sunday, and industrial schools as well as colleges.[2] But it is doubtful if the Bureau, which had a lifetime of only five years, could have achieved this success without the help of the numerous mission and philanthropic agencies of the North.

---

[1] Bullock, A History of Negro Education, pp. 18-19.

[2] Julius H. Parmelee, "Freedmen's Aid Societies, 1861-71," in Jones, Negro Education, II, 268-275. Bullock, A History of Negro Education, pp. 15-35, presents a cursory discussion of the first efforts at education of the freedmen during the period 1862-1867.

Of the former the most important was the American Missionary Association, a predominantly Congregationalist organization which was aided by such other denominations as the Wesleyan Methodists and the Free Will Baptists.[3] As early as September 17, 1861, the Association, responding to a call from General Butler at Fortress Monroe, Virginia, established the first known day school among the freedmen. In 1862-63 schools for freedmen were opened at Newport News, Portsmouth, Suffolk, and Yorkstown, Virginia; at Beaufort, St. Helena, and Port Royal, South Carolina; at Memphis, and at St. Louis. In 1864 the number of teachers and missionaries in the South under the Association's direction was 250; four years later the number had risen to 532.[1] By 1871 the American Missionary Association had founded the following institutes: Berea College in Kentucky, Hampton Institute in Virginia, Fisk University and LeMoyne Normal Institute in Tennessee, Talladega Institute in Alabama, Straight College in Louisiana, and Tougaloo College in Mississippi.[2]

---

[1] Additional information on the work of the Freedmen's Bureau can be found in Paul S. Pierce, The Freedmen's Bureau, A Chapter in the History of Reconstruction (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1904); and George R. Bentley, A History of the Freedmen's Bureau (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955).

[2] Franklin, From Slavery to Freedom, p. 308.

[3] Suzanne Carson, "Samuel Chapman Armstrong: Missionary to the South" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, 1952), p. 163. A somewhat unbalanced study of the Association can be found in Augustus Field Beard, A Crusade of Brotherhood, A History of the American Missionary Association (Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1909).

Bullock feels that the missionaries who flocked South to aid in the education of the freedmen,

> were by moral orientation and training peculiarly prepared to shoulder the responsibility. They were in the main devout Christians. The spiritual aspirations that fed their missionary zeal also kept alive their anti-slavery belief that teaching the Negro to read and understand the Bible was absolutely essential to his religious and moral development. . . . Largely trained in New England colleges and universities . . . they had interpreted the Emancipation Proclamation in terms of what it was supposed to mean--the freedom of Negroes to care for themselves and participate in a free society like other people.[3]

---

[1] Ullin W. Leavell, *Philanthropy in Negro Education* (Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1930), pp. 31-33.

[2] *Ibid*., pp. 34-39.

[3] Bullock, *A History of Negro Education*, p. 24. See also Henry L. Swint, *The Northern Teacher in the South, 1862-1870* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1941).

Working in concert with local commanders and later the Freedmen's Bureau, these teachers helped give the South some semblance of institutional education within a remarkably short time. By 1865 fourteen Southern states had established 575 schools, employing 1,171 teachers for the 71,779 Negro and white children in regular attendance.[1]

Trained as the teachers were in the New England tradition, it is hardly surprising that many of the curricula were classical in design. However, at the same time, numerous teachers were quite conscious of the more immediate needs of their pupils. Occasionally, signs of this awareness showed through in the curricula, many of which were sprinkled with non-literary subjects. The development of habits of thrift, long a New England article of educational faith, was nurtured through varied experiences. The idea of the special needs of the freedmen and the subsequent vogue of industrial education were to be crystallized and codified by a young Freedmen's Bureau agent in Virginia, Samuel Chapman Armstrong. When the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute was opened on April 1, 1868, by the founding American Missionary Society, it was Armstrong who stood there as principal. He combined his duties as principal of Hampton with those of Freedmen's agent until 1870, when he resigned his federal appointment and broke the Association's ties with the school so that it could be incorporated in Virginia with its own Board of Trustees.

Before examining Armstrong's role in the growth of education among the freedmen, however, let us look at a prominent philanthropic agency of the early post-war era and several other developments which were to influence his course of action. In a letter dated February 7, 1867, George Foster Peabody created the Peabody Education Fund with the following words:

---

[1] Bullock, A History of Negro Education, p. 29.

> . . . I give to you, gentlemen, most of whom have been my personal and especial friends, the sum of one million of dollars, to be . . . held in trust, and the income thereof used and applied in your discretion for the promotion and encouragement of intellectual, moral, or industrial education among the young of the more destitute portions of the Southern and Southwestern states of our union. . . .[1]

At the second meeting of the Trustees on March 20, 1867, Robert C. Winthrop, Chairman of the Trustees, noted that, "Mr. Peabody had expressed his desire that at the outset as much as possible should be done for common school or rudimentary education, and that such measures might be adopted as would, for the present, give an education to the greatest number of young children."[2] The further policies of the Trustees had been outlined by Barnas Sears, former President of Brown University and first general agent of the Peabody Fund, in a letter to Winthrop, dated March 14, 1867. He wrote that,

> of course, effective schools, that shall be permanent, is the great desideratum. This is not only the best thing for the young, but they furnish to the people at large the strongest argument in favor of popular education. Let good schools, springing up from the soil, growing out of the

---

[1] Proceedings of the Trustees of the Peabody Education Fund, 1867 (Boston: John Wilson and Sons, 1867), p. 3.

[2] Ibid., p. 15.

> wants of the people, and meeting those wants, be sprinkled all over the South, as examples, and be made the nuclei for others, and let them be established and controlled, as far as possible, by the people themselves, and they will in time grow into State systems.[1]

He further recommended that the Trustees could best achieve these effective schools in the South by using the money in the following ways: aid to normal schools, especially for the training of female teachers for primary schools; aid in the form of scholarships to young men in institutions of higher learning who would obligate themselves to teach; financial encouragement to teachers' associations; and the promotion of that education which sought to apply science to the industrial pursuits of man.[2]

Sears brought to his task the knowledge that~~,~~ except for a few cities, there existed no facilities for public education in the South. He also realized that authoritarian imposition would accomplish little in the educational sphere. Although the South had been defeated militarily, she could still resist, passively if no other way, innovations which were at odds with her traditions. Sears encountered apathy to the idea of public education. But, undaunted,

> he sought out the supporters of schools, or at least those who recognized the need of them, wherever he went and he worked with them regardless of political party. He realized the cost of public schools and he sought support of them from public officers, from the propertied men who viewed the changed civilization with realism, from men with a social

---

[1] Proceedings of the Trustees of the Peabody Education Fund, 1881, p. 307.

[2] Ibid., pp. 307-308.

> sense, from men of the rising middle class. He used the Peabody money as a great advertising fund to help sell efficient free commonschools to the people.[1]

By June of 1872 Sears felt that the principle of general education by public authority was "pretty well settled." Although this view may have been somewhat sanguine, there can be little doubt that Sears and the Peabody Education Fund had done a great deal to awaken the South to the need for public education.

The Reconstruction Act of 1867 imposed upon the South a regime totally at odds with its traditions. The state constitutions drawn up in 1867 and 1868 were the most progressive the South had ever known. All abolished slavery; several even sought to eliminate racial distinctions in the possession of property; and most abolished property qualifications for voting and holding office.[2] Although Negroes participated in government at all levels, they exercised control over few state governments for an appreciable length of time. It did not take long for the more reactionary white elements in the South to undo the social and educational progress achieved by Negroes during the Reconstruction Era.

The tenuous alliance which had arisen between the political leadership of the poor whites, the newly enfranchised Negroes, and the carpetbaggers from the North was founded as much on mutual weakness as on strength. These poor whites brought to the constitutional conventions not only a desire for a free franchise but the demand for a system of free schooling for their children, supported by local and state taxation.[1] On both these points they found their natural allies among the freedmen. "The Reconstruction constitutional conventions and legislatures extended the provisions of educational status to include Negroes. They placed expenditure for the education of Negro children on a parity with expenditures for white children. The voting power of Negroes exacted promises of continual fairness from the Democratic leaders who overthrew the 'carpetbag' regimes in the years 1874-77."[2] However, as early as 1870, some indication of the future pattern had emerged. The white Southerners had accepted the Fourteenth Amendment under duress, and in spirit they rejected the concept of racial equality. Although they permitted the education of the freedmen, they rejected the notion that this should be done at public expense.[3] Indeed, in the final analysis, all the promises which the Negroes' leadership exacted from the whites proved to be ephemeral, for soon the agrarian whites opposed Negro education as much on principle as on the matter of fiscal expediency.

---

[1] Jesse Pearl Rice, J. L. M. Curry, Southerner, Statesman and Educator (New York: King's Crown Press, 1949), p. 93.

[2] Franklin, From Slavery to Freedom, p. 316.

---

[1] W. E. B. DuBois' theory that the laboring white classes offered resistance to the idea of public education because they accepted their subordination to the propertied class and generally regarded education as a luxury to be enjoyed only by that class is unacceptable to this writer. See Black Reconstruction (Philadelphia: Albert Saifer Publishers, 1935), p. 641 ff.

[2] Bond, The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order, p. 81.

[3] Bullock, A History of Negro Education, p. 52.

18

Along with the initial pledge to maintain Negro schools on an equal footing with those for white children, the increasingly conservative legislatures throughout the South had also pledged themselves to reduce expenditures. No one had bargained with the educational impulse that soon drew hosts of white children into the newly created public school systems, creating a need for more school revenue than could easily be found in the impoverished South. It was not long before these same legislatures, faced with the rising power of the small white farmer who demanded that his children be educated in a public school system, decided on their course of action. The remedy adopted was quite simple: if there was not enough money available for distribution to all children, white and black, such funds as were available should be distributed among the white schools with equity, and the Negro schools would simply have to suffer. One example, drawn from data collected in 1910, will illustrate the course of action followed: in that year the per capita expenditures for each white child in public school in South Carolina was $10.00; for each Negro child it was $1.44.[1]

Reconstruction did not end abruptly as a result of Congressional or Presidential fiat; it merely faded away as restraints were relaxed and the more stringent and repugnant (to the white South) legislation repealed. When Hayes became President after the disputed election of 1876, one of his first acts was the prompt withdrawal of Federal troops. The South was left to rule itself, without Northern interference or Negro influence. Thus, the Compromise of 1877 was the sign for the reactionaries to step up their campaign in the South without fear of retribution. The emergence of these white reactionaries who later came to be epitomized by Tillman, Watson, and Vardaman, coupled with the steady disenfranchisement of the Negro, pointed the way for the social and political currents of the decades to come. The black educational currents, off to such a rapid flow in 1863, were soon to be detoured also.

---

[1] Jones, Negro Education, I, 23.

## The Beginning of Vocational Education

The idea of industrial and manual training was hardly a novel one in nineteenth century America. As early as the seventeenth century industrial tendencies in educational thought could be discerned in the writings of Comenius, Becher, Descartes, and Leibnitz on the Continent, and of Petty and Cowley in England, to mention only a few.[1] The reasons for this concern were numerous, but among the most important could be included: (1) the necessity of a course of study which could afford a preparation for everyday life; (2) school education in the manual arts was considered a means of relieving the poverty and destitution resulting from the devastating wars of the period; (3) the breakdown of the guild system; and (4) the growing differentiation of upper-class from lower-class education led to the introduction into the latter of industrial and manual subjects for the purposes of vocational training.

---

[1] Louis F. Anderson, The History of Manual and Industrial Education (New York: Appleton, Century, Croft, Inc., 1926), p. 12.

It was against just this anti-democratic bias that Rousseau took aim in Emile, published in 1762, which opened a new era in the history of the theory and practice of industrial education.[1] It was as a democrat that he argued for giving handwork an important place in the educational program of high and low alike. He urged systematic instruction and training in some form of manual industry as a direct challenge to the aristocratic prejudices against manual labor. Before the Industrial Revolution manual training could be construed quite simply as training for a specific trade or task. The gradual decline of the apprenticeship system, under which auspices much of the manual training had been carried out, in the face of the Industrial Revolution, can probably be considered as one of the most influential factors contributing to the movement for school education in the industries. After the Industrial Revolution in England there seems to have been a subtle blend of the manual aspect of training--which, as noted above was primarily task or trade oriented--with the industrial aspect, which tended more to favor training in the use of the new machinery which had come into being as a result of that Revolution. Although some institutions tended to maintain the distinction between manual and industrial training, most did not, and by the 1880's the rubric of industrial education came to connote any kind of non-academic training in most institutions in the United States. Agricultural and household training, although quite different in content and conception, also came to be included under this rubric to a great extent.

---

[1] Anderson, The History of Manual and Industrial Education, p. 98.

Emmanuel Fellenberg, the Swiss educator who believed that the way to improve the human condition was through training of individuals to a more efficient and intelligent performance of their duties appertaining to their station in life, had a marked influence on educational thought in the United States. While some attention was given to agriculture and handicrafts in the gymnasium reserved for the more aristocratic youth in his experiment at Hofwyl, industrial and especially agricultural labor constituted the chief means of education for those of the lower classes.[1]

Closer to home, Benjamin Franklin was making known his educational ideas,[2] as was Henry Barnard who, during the 1830's delivered a lecture on industrial education in which "he not only gave manufacturers timely warning of the necessity of making better provisions for industrial education but also recommended to this end the introduction of drawing into the public schools."[1] This speech predated by some forty years a course of action adopted by the Massachusetts legislature in 1870 which provided for industrial art training of the working classes both in common and special schools.

---

[1] Anderson, The History of Manual and Industrial Education, p. 91.

[2] See John H. Best, ed., Benjamin Franklin on Education (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, 1962).

The sentiment for industrial and agricultural education, stemming partially from the educational theories of Pestalozzi and Fellenberg and partially from the nineteenth century American milieu, found congenial soil in the Yankee traditions of morality, thrift and industry, economic independence, and material success. This sentiment co-existed somewhat incongruously, but on a slightly different plane, with the classical educational tradition of New England. It was only in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, however, that the concept of industrial education enjoyed its first considerable vogue on the United States.[2] This was partly the result of the growing industrialization and increasing mechanization in American life, as well as the application of scientific knowledge to technology. Meier notes that "contemporaneous with the Jacksonian democratic upheaval of the years after 1825 and with the New England transcendentalism of the same period, this early interest in industrial education was part of the whole ferment of ante-bellum reform which included temperance, . . . trade unionism and Utopian socialism, pacificism, abolitionism. . . ."[1]

---

[1] Anderson, The History of Manual and Industrial Education, p. 129. A useful discussion of the growth of vocationalism in American education can be found in Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957 (New York: Vintage Books, 1961), pp. 23-57.

[2] August Meier, Negro Thought in America, 1880-1915 (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1966), p. 85.

The emergence of militant abolitionism and the Negro Convention Movement in the North in the 1830's provided the industrial education idea with a vital impulse. An important factor in Negro thinking about manual labor schools during this period was the exclusion of Negro youth from apprenticeships in the North, a prerequisite for learning a skilled trade. At the 1853 National Convention in Rochester, New York, no less a figure than Frederick Douglass noted that since Negroes were excluded from workshops and counting houses, they must make up the lack themselves by establishing trade schools.[2] During the decades of the 1850's, when Negroes were rebuffed in their attempts to secure an unrestricted franchise in the North, they tended to emphasize self-help, racial solidarity, moral uplift, and economic development as solutions to the exascerbated conditions of race relations. The accumulating sentiment and agitation in the 1850's for federal aid to agricultural and industrial education, culminating in the 1862 Morrill Act, gave an added impetus to the industrial and agricultural education movement throughout the country.

The missionary societies flocking South from 1861 onwards, imbued as they were with the Puritan gospel of work, self-help, thrift, and morality were of incalculable influence in perpetuating the idea of industrial and agricultural education among the freedmen. And none epitomizes the spirit of the times better than the American Missionary Association. Incorporated in 1849 for the purpose of operating Christian missions and educational institutions at home and abroad, the Association decided that the ". . . negro race must be taught to save itself and how to do it; to work out its own future, with its own teachers and educators. Therefore, reliance must be placed on permanent institutions and permanent teachers for them."[1] The type of education for the freedmen to be provided by the American Missionary Association was defined as follows:

---

[1] August Meier, "The Beginnings of Industrial Education in Negro Schools," The Midwest Journal, VII (Spring, 1955), 21.

[2] Reported in ibid., p. 28.

> For a people beginning their history with the rights and privileges of freedmen this [industrial education] was absolutely essential. The Association's theory was to make industrial education a contributing force to Christian education. . . . Upon a superstructure of mental enlightenment [the freedmen] must build themselves up by intelligent industries. Hence, with the planting of permanent schools leading up to higher education, plans were at once made for such industrial training as seemed to be practical. . . . Labor was honorable and to be honored. Thus the creed with which the Association began took in the school of the mind, the conscience of the heart, the school for handicrafts and for the culture of the soil. . . .[2]

The Association could hardly have found a better apostle to implement its creed in the South than the young Freedmen's Aid Bureau agent in Hampton, Virginia, in 1867--Samuel Chapman Armstrong.

Armstrong's parents had gone to Hawaii in 1832 under the auspices of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, a strongly Calvinistic group.[1] In the educational sphere, where Armstrong's father played a leading role, the work was to be practical. The Hilo Boarding School for Boys, which was founded in 1836 and which later served as a model for Hampton Institute, even included a program of compulsory labor. The senior Armstrong's educational philosophy concerning the so-called backward peoples is best summed up in his own words:

---

[1] Beard, A Crusade of Brotherhood, p. 147.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 163-164.

> My general plan is to aim at the improvement of the _heart_, the _head_, and the _body_ at once. This is a lazy people and if they are to be made more industrious the work must begin with the young. So I am making strenuous efforts to have some sort of manual labor connected with every school and teachers are paid as much for going out to work on the land with the boys as they are for teaching.[2]

Manual labor as a panacea for indolence (or what was considered as such) was to become a popular idea for white educators all over the world as the nineteenth century wore on.

After several years at Williams College, where he came under the strong influence of President Mark Hopkins (in whose home he lived), young Armstrong joined the Union army in 1862 as a captain. Lest we think that Armstrong's concern for the plight of the individual Negro was anything more than a vague principle of universal freedom for all men, we should bear in mind his initial attitude towards abolition, contained in a letter to his brother in December, 1862: ". . . these negroes--as far as I've seen yet--are worse than the Kanakas [of Hawaii], and hardly worth fighting for."[1] But after the Emancipation Proclamation and his command of the Ninth Regiment of the United States Colored Troops, we discern a change in his attitude. To his friend Archibald Hopkins, he writes that "the nigs are willing, learn very quickly, and the regiment runs twice as smoothly as a Volunteer regiment."[2] So it was among the Negroes that Samuel Chapman Armstrong had found his calling. But this is no way implied egalitarian ideas on his part towards the Negro; rather he responded with fervor to aid a helpless people and remove it from bondage and oppression. Ideas of equality were not at issue; helping the underprivileged was.

---

[1] This discussion of Armstrong's career is taken from Carson, "Samuel Chapman Armstrong: Missionary to the South"; Edith Armstrong Talbot, _Samuel Chapman Armstrong: A Biographical Study_ (New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1904); and Francis G. Peabody, _Education for Life: The Story of Hampton Institute_ (New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1918).

[2] Carson, "Samuel Chapman Armstrong: Missionary to the South," p. 20.

Soon after his appointment to the Freedmen's Aid Bureau Armstrong wrote to his superiors about the probable turn of educational events: "The South will do nothing for the education of the negroes--the North cannot long conduct it--they must do it for themselves. . . ."[3] He also felt that the South would accept and tolerate colored teachers more readily than it would the Yankee school marms, whose dogmatism seemed to grate even on him at times, although he had nothing but praise for their work. When he received his appointment as superintendent of the

---

[1] Carson, "Samuel Chapman Armstrong: Missionary to the South," p. 83.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 104.

[3] _Ibid._, p. 140.

American Missionary Association's schools in the Hampton vicinity, he was convinced that the freedmen's personal habits would have to be changed, and education was the sole method of bringing about this metamorphosis. He would inculcate New England Puritan habits: at this period his faith in the efficacy of the Yankee code of morality was as uncritical as his opinion of Southern morality was hypercritical.

Despite his initial antagonistic feelings towards all things Southern, Armstrong soon realized after he became involved in his educational experiment at Hampton that in order to gain essential Southern support, he would have to conciliate Southern opinion. Thus, he began to look for some basis for mutual understanding and compromise. He soon discovered that certain small, but influential, elements of Southern society had conservative economic views similar to his own, and that there were some who accepted the "New South" philosophy as enthusiastically as he did. He, along with most Southerners, believed that there were inherent differences between the races and this made imperative a special type of training. His own words reveal his ideas about the new South and the place of the Negro therein:

> The only hope for the future of the South is in a vigorous effort to elevate the colored race by practical education that shall fit them [sic] for life. . . . The Negroes, who are to form the working classes of the South, must be taught not only to do their work well, but to know what their work means, and while at Hampton the discipline of hard work keeps away the indolent, it attracts the determined and deserving, endows the graduates with a spirit of

> self-reliance and manliness, and returns them to the world something more than mere pedagogues and farmers. . . .[1]

Armstrong's ideas immediately took hold, not so much because of any intrinsic merit they contained but because his philosophy--to reform the South by industrialization and through the development of her natural resources, using the freedmen as a stable, literate, and semi-skilled labor force--conformed to the dominant economic and political trends of the post-war era. The fact that his own paternalistic view of Negro potentialities was not unlike that of most Southerners was soon appreciated, and the idea that he was more concerned with the peaceful assimilation of the Negro into the nation's economy than with stressing social and political rights opened many a door and purse to him. And the concept of industrial and agricultural education, which would make the freedman a more reliable economic tool rather than just another "uppity nigger," as it was felt a literary education would, seemed to solve everyone's problems--it salved the Northern conscience because the Negro was being educated; it pacified the Negro because he was being assured that his training would ensure him gainful employment, and it promised to provide a source of cheap labor, not far removed from slave labor, with which the South hoped to industrialize.

Armstrong's educational philosophy was couched in the platitudes of the day--in terms of *laissez-faire* and the gospel of wealth, in terms of uplifting backward races (especially popular after Social Darwinism became the vogue) who were not really equal to whites, in terms of frugality, temperance, self-help, morality, economic independence. This appealed to the average upper and middle-class American, North and South, and eased the path for the work of the Slater Fund, created in 1882, which was to spread the gospel far and wide.

---

[1] Samuel Chapman Armstrong, *Ideas on Education* (Hampton: Hampton Institute Press, 1908), pp. 3-4.

In a letter dated March 4, 1882, John F. Slater, the textile manufacturer from Connecticut, created the Fund with the following words:

> . . . It is my desire at this time to appropriate . . . the sum of one million of dollars ($1,000,000.00); and I hereby invite you to procure a charter. . . . The general object which I desire to have exclusively pursued, is the uplifting of the lately emancipated population of the Southern states, and their posterity, by conferring on them the blessings of Christian education.[1]

At its second meeting on October 7, 1882, the Trustees resolved "that so far as practicable the scholars receiving the benefits of this foundation shall be trained in some manual occupation, simultaneously with their mental and moral instruction."[2] Armstrong's philosophy had taken root, and the Slater Fund's largess was to be used to strengthen those institutions which understood the beneficient effects of industrial education.

---

[1] Proceedings of the John F. Slater Fund for the Education of Freedmen, 1882 (Baltimore: John F. Slater Fund, 1882), pp. 3-4.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

It is not difficult to understand why the Slater Fund had so many adherents and supplicants. In response to a promise of financial aid for their hard pressed institutions, many Negro schools quickly instituted industrial and/or agricultural departments. In his report for 1883, the general agent, Atticus C. Haygood, noted that ". . . a considerable portion of the money has been used in starting and equipping the industrial departments in the various schools. This was necessary at first. . . ."[1] It should be pointed out that few students attending Southern Negro schools in this period were in the college departments, and the industrial and agricultural training was limited almost exclusively to work on the elementary and secondary levels. Because of the great expense involved in establishing a full-fledged industrial and/or agricultural program--equipment for such work was prohibitively expensive--many schools aided by the Slater Fund tended to pay lip-service to the idea rather than to institute effective programs. Neither the Slater Fund nor any other group was willing to provide enough money to organize a vocational program commensurate with the economic realities of the period. The Southern Negro educational facilities were hardly designed to produce skilled artisans.

But the efficacy of the Slater Fund approach--notwithstanding the fact that in many instances the industrial and/or agricultural training was not even a close approximation of what the Trustees and their agent envisioned--is illustrated by Haygood's comment in 1888:

---

[1] Proceedings of the John F. Slater Fund for the Education of Freedmen, 1883, p. 12.

> Three years ago there was occasion to make a careful investigation of the studies pursued at the higher schools for colored people in the South. At that time in twenty-three of the teaching institutions for colored people, there were enrolled 7,273 students. By actual count it was found that less than five percent of the whole number were engaged in what were considered as classical studies. The rest are learning just those things that a people must learn first--the rudiments of learning. . . .[1]

The presidents of the schools aided by the Slater Fund--most of whom were white--quite naturally waxed enthusiastic over the concept of industrial education. For them it served several functions, or so the popular thinking of the day had it: (1) pedagogically, it aided mental development; and (2) morally, it inculcated habits of thrift and industry, as well as a sense of independence. In addition, it supplied a source of inexpensive labor which could be used to erect buildings and raise crops on the campuses. This education, it was felt, also prepared students to earn their living through trades, as well as fostering efficient house and farmwives. Thus, with the Slater Fund largess and the ideological rationale of morality and self-improvement to bolster it, the vogue of industrial education wound its way into the 1890's.

But these same people who hailed this education for its ability to raise the Negro race and inculcate in it a belief in the dignity of labor (surely one of the most overworked phrases in all discussions of the so-called "backward" peoples) neglected several very important facts. One, of course, was that because of the great expense involved and the dearth of equipment and personnel, training for trades remained a largely unachieved object. As Meier points out,

---

[1] Proceedings of the John F. Slater Fund for the Education of Freedmen, 1888, p. 39.

> it is one of the ironies of history that neither Hampton nor Tuskegee took the first step in offering Negroes the technical training necessary for effective competition in an industrial age. It was Howard University, noted for its high grade of liberal education, which in 1915 introduced engineering on a collegiate level in its newly organized Schools of Manual Arts and Applied Science.[1]

While the typical industrial or household education offered at Negro schools in the South could indeed train a girl how to keep her house cleaner, it could hardly turn out the number of skilled tradesmen its advocates claimed for it, if only because the high cost militated against this. Sharecroppers and heavy laborers it could produce; skilled artisans--such as plumbers, bricklayers, carpenters--were not forthcoming from the educational mill.

Jones' 1917 survey, based on 1910 figures, indicates that approximately 1 percent of all employed Negro males in the South were carpenters, less than one-tenth of 1 percent were plumbers and steamfitters, while some 61 percent were either farm or heavy laborers.[2] But even if the skilled artisans could have been produced, it is doubtful, given the state of the Southern economy at the time and the reluctance to hire black artisans, if vocational opportunities to practice their skills would have been available for more than a handful of Negroes.

---

[1] Meier, Negro Thought in America, 1880-1915, p. 93.

[2] Jones, Negro Education, I, 84.

A second neglected fact regarding industrial and agricultural education was that the freedmen were to use their white neighbors and masters as points of reference, and were to desire that type of education which, in their eyes, made the white man powerful. And since the financial rewards and prestige resulting from industrial and agricultural education were hardly commensurate with those derived from academic studies, it is not surprising that the Negro should be less than enthusiastic about vocational training.

But the pedagogical rationale, coupled with the funds which accompanied it, was not the sole factor in the promotion of industrial and agricultural education for Negroes in the South in the period from 1880 to 1900. Probably the most compelling reason, but one which only surfaced occasionally, was the feeling predominant among those most interested in Negro education in the South, that this type of education was the only kind which local whites would suffer in their presence. And for those of Vardaman's stamp, not even this kind was acceptable. Here was evidence of Armstrong's compromise between North, South, and the Negroes, and the essence of Booker T. Washington's later "Tuskegee Compromise." That Negroes were being trained in skills which were rapidly becoming outmoded by the progress of industrialization bothered the Northern capitalists/philanthropists no more than the fact that their current philosophy of economic individualism was no longer applicable to the economic conditions of the time. White Southerners, on the other hand, either interpreted or misinterpreted industrial education as a device for preventing the advancement of Negroes. So, Northern philanthropy and public opinion were well pleased to find that industrial education constituted a program of Negro "uplift" acceptable to the dominant class of white Southerners.[1]

The concept of industrial education for Negroes was not, however, without its opponents, black and white. One of the latter was William T. Harris, United States Commissioner of Education. In 1890 he argued that industrial education was merely economical in nature (which it was not), and since segregation had robbed Negroes of the more uplifting contacts with whites "only intellectual education could prevent Negroes from reverting to their former lower steps of life."[2] Those who agreed with Harris and saw that industrial education would only keep the Negro in a subordinate position might have achieved a larger hearing had Armstrong's disciple not appeared on the scene at this juncture.

## The Influence of Booker T. Washington

Booker T. Washington, a former slave, entered the fledgling Hampton Institute in 1872. Armstrong's influence immediately made itself felt on young Washington, who later said that, "I never met any man who, in my estimation, was the equal of General Armstrong."[1] The part that Hampton played in shaping his educational philosophy was decisive, for the Tuskegee Institute which Washington founded in 1881 was an almost exact replica of his Alma Mater. The young man learned from Armstrong that education had to be related to the common needs of life. Consequently, Washington struggled to make his school an integral part of the community in which it was located. One of the basic aims of the Tuskegee experiment was to train Negroes to do better what they had always done before. Thus, agricultural training, coupled with carpentry, was the most important channel for the curriculum to follow. The school's mission, therefore, was largely dedicated to supplying well-equipped teachers for the various rural schools which would stress agriculture, gardening and carpentry, as well as grammar and arithmetic.[2]

---

[1] August Meier, "The Vogue of Industrial Education," The Midwest Journal, VII (Fall, 1955), 248.

[2] Quoted from Bullock, A History of Negro Education, p. 78.

If Washington was Armstrong's educational disciple, it would not be unfair to say that he was his political one as well. Like his mentor, Washington agreed that Negroes should eschew any idea of social or political equality and should, instead, concentrate on uplifting themselves economically. His educational philosophy, centered around helping Negroes to help themselves by means of industrial and agricultural training, coupled with his admonitions to his race to accept segregation and the educational system concomitant with that system, helped to allay the fears of white Southerners concerning the Negro and to win the support of whites of the North and South for the public education movement in general.

---

[1] Booker T. Washington, Up From Slavery (New York: Boston Books, 1963), p. 37.

[2] More details on the work at Tuskegee can be found in Samuel R. Spencer, Jr., Booker T. Washington and the Negro's Place in American Life (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1955), and Charles W. Dabney, Universal Education in the South, I (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1936), 506-513.

Bullock feels that Washington's greatest educational influence rested with the weight he gave the "special education" movement.

> He left little doubt in the minds of a large number of educators and philanthropists that Negroes required a particular kind of education for their particular condition. . . . He chose to educate Negroes within the framework of a racial division of labor that had always existed in the South. Although he did not advocate industrial education for every Negro child to the exclusion of the professions and other branches of learning, he did imply that the sole excuse for these latter was in the existence of the segregated communities where Negroes were forced to live.[1]

This emphasis upon the industrial hit the more radical Negro leaders with exaggerated force. Washington's opponents, the most eloquent and persistent of whom was W. E. B. DuBois, disavowed and fought against the Tuskegeen's political and social abstinence and timidity. The battle between the industrial-school idea and the liberal arts-school idea raged for many years. In the end, however, both the industrial schools, like Hampton and Tuskegee, and the liberal arts schools, like Fisk and Atlanta, were engaged in educating Southern Negro youth. But the two types of schools were educating Negroes for different classes not within the wider spectrum of American society, but rather within the narrower Negro caste system.

---

[1] Bullock, A History of Negro Education, p. 85.

Because of his ability to sense and express the prevalent climate of opinion, Washington soon became the darling of the Northern and Southern factions, as well as of the philanthropists. Here was a man who, after all, saw things the way they did. It was the Atlanta Exposition in 1895 which projected him into the forefront of Negro leadership. In that fateful speech he said, in part:

> In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress. . . . The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremist folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing.[1]

In return for those few words Booker Taliaferro Washington was to become not only the official spokesman for his race but was to receive the power to help shape Negro education in the South for many decades to come. No word had he uttered about the repression of Negro civil liberties in the South, no word had he uttered about the gross disparities between per capita expenditures for Negro and white school children, no word had he uttered about the Jim Crow laws. He spoke of 'privileges' rather than of 'rights.' It was what he did not say almost as much as what he did say that enabled him to rise to a position of power and prominence. By his assiduous choice of words he had managed to conciliate almost everyone, and the money which began to flow to his institution and those of a similar stamp bore eloquent testimony to the efficacy of the Compromise of 1895.

---

[1] Washington, Up From Slavery, p. 157.

Industrial education, for which Washington had become the most effective spokesman, came into vogue not so much because of him as because of the fact that it attracted support from a wide spectrum of opinion. And this was possible because of the large variety of interpretations to which it was susceptible. As mentioned above, it appealed to Southerners and most Northern whites who thought about it because it appeared to relegate Negroes to an inferior position. It appealed to a public opinion that saw economic, pedagogical, and moral values in its practice. In short, it fitted the spirit of the age. Indeed, "Booker T. Washington became great and powerful not because he initiated a trend, but because he expressed it so well."[1] With Washington's influence to buttress them against critics, black and white, those responsible for the direction of Negro education in the South set about to consolidate the idea of this "special education" for Southern Negroes.

## The Planning of Negro Education

The first Capon Springs Conference for Education in the South opened on June 29, 1898.[1] The very nature of the conference personnel made the situation ripe for compromise.[2] J. L. M. Curry, agent of the Peabody and Slater Funds, set the tone for subsequent actions of the Conference when he announced that, whatever form of education the conferees saw fit to outline for the Negro, it should be borne in mind that "the white people are to be the leaders, to take the initiative, to have the direct control in all matters pertaining to civilization and the highest interest of our beloved land. History demonstrates that the Caucasian will rule."[3] Seeking the middle road of compromise, the leaders of the Conference decided, in subsequent years, that since Negroes did not have access to the mass systems of cultural diffusion as did the whites and since the conferees had no idea of integrating the society so that these facilities could be made available to all, it was necessary that Negroes train their own leadership. For this purpose, then, it was concluded that certain Negro colleges would be strengthened for the purpose of training a strong professional class--doctors, lawyers, ministers--which would be responsible for raising the general physical and moral level of the race.

---

[1] Meier, Negro Thought in America, 1880-1915, p. 99.

---

[1] Dabney, Universal Education in the South, devotes much of his second volume to an examination of the origin of this conference, its successors, and the rise of the Southern Education Movement.

[2] Bullock, A History of Negro Education, p. 91. Among those present at this first conference were Hollis B. Frisell, white, principal of Hampton; Reverend A. B. Hunter, white, president of St. Augustine's College, Raleigh, North Carolina; D. B. Satterfield, white, of Scotia Seminary, Concord, North Carolina. Thirty-six persons attended this first conference, called to establish a common ground on which they could build a new kind of education for Southern Negroes.

[3] Proceedings of the Second Capon Springs Conference for Education in the South, 1899 (Capon Springs: n.p.), p. 38. "And," Curry added, "he ought to rule."

Having resolved the problems of educating the Negro leaders within their caste system, the Conference turned its attention to the problem of educating the Negro masses. The answer was almost foreordained, "for the leadership of the conference was composed of men who had long since been converted to this educational ideology."[1] Two of the prime movers behind the industrial education movement were Robert Curtis Ogden and William Henry Baldwin, Jr. Indeed, it had been in the parlor of Ogden's Brooklyn residence that a few men had met in 1867 to consider Samuel Chapman Armstrong's plan for a vocational institute for freedmen. From this meeting grew Hampton Institute, with which Ogden was associated for forty-five years as trustee, financial supporter, and finally as president of the board.[2] Baldwin had gone South as a businessman conscious of the value of Negro labor, labor which he considered indispensable for the efficient operation of his Southern Railway. He felt that the prosperity of his railroad and of the South depended on the productive ability of the population, and he felt the source of this ability to be the Negro. His stake in industrial education, to produce efficient workmen, was large, and it is not surprising that he was a staunch advocate of industrial education and, later, a trustee of Tuskegee.[1]

---

[1] Bullock, A History of Negro Education, pp. 100-103.

[2] Dabney, Universal Education in the South, II, 26-27.

Through the influence of such personalities the various Conferences made three distinct decisions with regard to education for Negroes.[2] First, slavery had shaped within the Negro mind some undesirable attitudes, which had been reinforced under the influence of Northern educators, who had led the freedmen to hope that through books they could enjoy the fruits of a literary education like white men. Consequently, it was decided at the second Conference, that the Negro had been educated away from his natural environment and that his education should concern only those fields available to him. This key decision marked the formulation of the concept of "Negro education." Secondly, it was decided, at the third Conference, that this special education--industrial education--of the Negro had to be directed towards increasing the labor value of his race, a labor value which would, not surprisingly, see the white man as the chief beneficiary. And lastly, the future of Negro education in the South was seen as directly related to the training of teachers, a matter which was then, and was to continue to be, the special concern of the denominational schools.

---

[1] Dabney, Universal Education in the South, II, 149-150. Dabney, pp. 468-469, includes others in this list who were responsible for the movement. "It was Ogden and Frissell of Hampton who shaped the movement which resulted in the Southern Education Conference for Education in the South and the various agencies which grew out of it. . . . Aided by George Foster Peabody, William H. Baldwin, Jr., Alexander Purves, George S. Dickerman, who had learned the Hampton methods while working for it . . . , these men started a campaign for public schools which in a generation revolutionized education in the Southern states." Louis R. Harlan, Separate and Unequal: Public School Campaigns and Racism in the Southern Seaboard States, 1901-1915 (New York: Atheneum, 1968) discusses with great perception the racial implications of the Southern Education Movement. He notes that "William H. Baldwin's hard-boiled philanthropy assumed that the Negro 'will willingly fill the more menial positions, and do the heavy work, at less wages,' leaving to whites the more expert labor." See especially Chapter III.

[2] Bullock, A History of Negro Education, pp. 101-104.

By the turn of the century, then, the pattern for Negro education in the South was set. Northern educators had decided to sell the idea of Negro education to white Southerners by sacrificing the principle of racial equality and propagating the idea of a "special education," tailor-made to fit the Negro race. Paradoxically enough, it was the Negro, the economic tool, who was to be the saviour of the South; however, the South he would save was not intended for him.

At the fourth Conference in 1901, a resolution was passed creating the Southern Education Board, formed to advocate public opinion in behalf of public schools for whites as well as blacks, and to handle gifts from foundations and individuals. This latter function was delegated to the trustees of the Southern Education Board, who later became known as the General Education Board.[1] In 1914 the Southern Education Board disbanded itself and transferred its functions to the General Education Board, thus lowering the curtain on a key organization in the South's educational renaissance. "The war to make the South accept its educational responsibilities to the Negro had been won. But the peace that followed had made education universal for the whites and special for the blacks."[1]

---

[1] Bullock, A History of Negro Education, pp. 107-108.

To the critics of the concept of "Negro education," those controlling its destiny could always point out that it had the support of the representative Negro, the most influential man of his race, the gentleman who in 1910 had dined with President Roosevelt. At the height of his influence in 1902, just before DuBois launched his initial attack on him, Booker T. Washington expressed his idea on Negro education in the following terms:

> [After 1865] there were young [Negro] men educated in foreign tongues, but few in carpentry or in mechanical or architectural drawing. . . . Too many were taken from the farm and educated, but educated in everything but farming. For this reason they had no interest in farming and did not return to it. . . . Our knowledge must be harnessed to the real things of life. . . . I believe most earnestly that for years to come the education of the people of my race should be so directed that the greatest proportion will be brought to bear upon the every-day practical things of life, upon something that is needed to be done, and something which they will be permitted to do in the community in which they reside.

And he continued:

---

[1] Bullock, A History of Negro Education, p. 116. The attitude of the South towards its responsibility for the Negro's betterment is summed up rather succinctly (and perhaps apocryphally) by a story which Dabney, Universal Education in the South, I, 46, relates involving Walter Hines Page. When asked by a reporter, in reference to education of Negroes at all, "if there was not a nigger in the woodpile," Hines replied, "you will find when the woodpile is turned over not a 'nigger,' but an uneducated white boy. He is the fellow we are after. We want to train both the white boy and the black boy, but we must train the white boy first, because we cannot do anything for the Negro boy until his white friend is convinced of his responsibility to him."

> I would teach the race that in industry the foundation must be laid--that the very best service which anyone can render to what is called higher education is to teach the present generation to provide a material or industrial foundation. On such a foundation . . . will grow habits of thrift, a love of work, economy, ownership of property, bank accounts. Out of it will grow practical education, professional education, positions of public responsibility. . . . I would set no limits to the attainments of the Negro in arts, in letters, or statesmanship, but I believe that the surest way to reach those ends is by laying the foundation in the little things of life that lie immediately about one's door. I plead for industrial education and development for the Negro not because I want to cramp him, but because I want to free him. I want to see him enter the all-powerful business and commercial world.[1]

For Washington, then, economic power was the means to all ends, and the way to this economic power lay in industrial education and development. As he himself said, he was not irrevocably opposed to college training and (in a move which makes one wonder about his credibility) did send his own children to an academically-oriented college. But with his great influence he did minimize its importance and discouraged philanthropic support of academic higher education for Negroes.

The most levelling criticism of the Tuskegee philosophy came from the well-honed pen of W. E. B. DuBois and ushered in the beginning of the decline of Booker T. Washington's power. Offended almost as much by the intimidating force and power of the 'Tuskegee Machine' as he was by the philosophy of education espoused by its head,[2] DuBois first launched out at his adversary in his famous chapter entitled "Of Mr. Booker T. Washington and Others" in The Souls of Black Folk, published in 1903. In part he said:

---

[1] Washington, "Industrial Education for the Negro," pp. 12-19.

[2] Meier, Negro Thought in America, 1880-1915, paints an excellent picture of the political power which Washington and his 'Tuskegee Machine' wielded.

> Mr. Washington represents in Negro thought the old attitude of adjustment and submission; but adjustment at such a peculiar time as to make his programme unique. This is an age of economic development, and Mr. Washington's programme naturally takes an economic cast. . . . Mr. Washington's programme practically accepts the alleged inferiority of the Negro races.[1]

He went on to discuss the triple paradox of Washington's career by noting that he was striving nobly to make artisans businessmen and property-owners; but that it was utterly impossible, under modern competitive methods, for workingmen and property owners to defend their rights and exist without the right of suffrage. The second paradox was that Washington insisted on thrift and self-respect, but at the same time counseled a silent submission to civic inferiority such as was bound to sap the manhood of any race in the long run. And the third paradox was that Washington advocated common-school and industrial training, and depreciated institutions of higher learning, but neither the Negro common-school, nor Tuskegee itself, could have remained open a day were it not for the teachers trained in Negro colleges or trained by their graduates. According to DuBois, the Tuskegeean doctrine of self-help tended to make the whites, North and South, shift the burden of the Negro problem to the Negroes' shoulders and stand aside as rather critical and pessimistic spectators. He insisted that "the South ought to be led, by candid and honest criticism, to assert her better self and to fulfill her full duty to the race she has cruelly wronged and is still wronging. The North--her co-partner in guilt--cannot salve her conscience by plastering it with gold. We cannot solve this problem by diplomacy and suaveness, by policy alone. . . ."[1]

---

[1] W. E. B. DuBois, The Souls of Black Folk (New York: Fawcett World Library, 1964), p. 48.

But as we have seen, it was by "policy alone" that the problem was solved, at least for the moment. The eloquent voices of DuBois and his colleagues, who demanded educational parity as they did political and social equality, were submerged beneath the power of the Tuskegee Machine. The Capon Springs Conferences had made it clear that Northern and Southern educators, aided by the Northern philanthropists and with the compliance of the Bookerites, had settled not on the most egalitarian principle but on the most expedient--that of vocational education for the Negro masses in the South.

Once the concept of 'special education' for Negroes took root, it became necessary to find sources of financial support so that the program could be maintained and pushed forward. This support came primarily from the geographical area which had made the South first aware of its responsibilies--the North. This was the era of the great industrial giants--of Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, George F. Peabody, John F. Slater, and Julius Rosenwald--all of whom were to play a vital role in the forwarding of the special education which had been outlined at Capon Springs. George Foster Peabody had set the tone of non-involvement in racial matters when he had established his Fund in 1867; the Fund "had aimed to keep the peace while holding fast to the racial status quo."[1]

---

[1] DuBois, The Souls of Black Folk, p. 53. DuBois alternatives to the Washingtonian idea of industrial education was an elitist idea he dubbed the Talented Tenth. He advocated two great aims of Negro education--the one dealing with knowledge and character, and the other seeking to give the child the requisite technical skills for the present age. The emphasis must be on the academically-oriented Negro colleges such as Fisk, Howard, Atlanta and Straight. For a fuller discussion of this view, see W. E. B. DuBois, "The Talented Tenth," in The Negro Problem, pp. 45-61.

The influence of Robert C. Ogden, who was to become a key figure in Negro education,[2] with the Rockefeller interests served him well, for between 1902 and 1909 the oil magnate placed some $53,000,000 with the General Education Board, accompanied by the suggestion that some of it could be used to meet the special needs of Southern education. Like his predecessors, Messrs. Peabody and Slater, Mr. Rockefeller's provisions were sufficiently vague to allow the Negro schools to receive the General Education Board largess as conditions warranted.[3]

The Slater Fund, which since 1882 had devoted its attention to the industrial and rural aspects of Negro education in the South, was joined in 1907 by another rural school movement, the Rural School Fund, Incorporated. Concerned with the problem of neglected school supervision in the Negro South, the Jeanes Fund, as it was more often called, was founded by Anna T. Jeanes, a Philadelphia Quaker.[1] Established with the cooperation of the principals of Hampton and Tuskegee, Messrs. Frisell and Washington, the Jeanes Fund formulated a tripartite policy in keeping with the idea of special education for Negroes: (1) that the general educational situation should be studied carefully; (2) that any work undertaken should be with the entire approval and cooperation of the local public school officials; and (3) that so far as possible the Fund should be used to help provide opportunities for effective training for the rural life among the Southern Negroes.[2] In the next year the executive committee of the Jeanes Fund, of which Booker T. Washington was chairman, selected James Hardy Dillard, a white professor of Latin at Tulane University, to be the first president of the Fund.[3]

---

[1] Bullock, A History of Negro Education, p. 121.

[2] Ibid., p. 119.

[3] See The General Education Board, an Account of Its Activities, 1902-1914 (New York: General Education Board, 1915).

The Julius Rosenwald Fund, incorporated on October 30, 1917, and backed by approximately $40,000,000, directed its attention initially towards building rural schools, later toward the support of high schools and colleges, and finally towards the granting of fellowships to enable Negroes and whites of unusual promise to advance their careers.[1] Rosenwald had become a trustee of Tuskegee in 1912, and he immediately offered the institute $5,000 per annum for five years on condition that other gifts could be secured to make a total of $50,000 per annum of additional receipts for the school. The benefactor soon placed in Washington's hands the direction of the work which he later supported in Negro school building construction.

---

[1] Detailed discussions of the Rural School Fund, Incorporated can be found in Arthur D. Wright and E. R. Redcay, The Negro Rural School Fund, Inc. (Anna T. Jeanes Foundation) 1907-1933 (Washington, D.C.: The Negro Rural School Fund, Inc., 1933); and Lance G. E. Jones, The Jeanes Teachers in the United States, 1908-1933 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1933).

[2] Wright and Redcay, op. cit., p. 11.

[3] More details about Dillard's career can be found in Benjamin Brawley, Doctor Dillard of the Jeanes Fund (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1930).

The philanthropic agencies were spurred on to their tasks by the frequent inability or unwillingness of public officials to do anything for Negro education. "What public officials lacked in their ability or willingness to supervise and nourish rural schools for Negroes, the state agent and Jeanes teacher supplied. The latter, almost alone, served well as a coordinator. Each Jeanes teacher, working with her school, became the point around which the functions of rural schools pivoted."[2] The Jeanes supervisors soon began to expand their functions and began to develop courses most closely related to rural life. Traditional textbooks were dropped and the supervisor began to orient the school increasingly around the rural aspect of the community. The Jeans supervisor was only one link in the chain which later came to include the state agent for Negro education, the county superintendents and, as a result of the passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 and the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917, the agricultural extension teacher and the teacher of trades and industries.[1] The great expansion in Negro education in the South was made possible largely because of the increase in school buildings, which had been the special interest of Julius Rosenwald.

---

[1] See Leavell, Philanthropy in Negro Education, pp. 77-117 and Edwin R. Embree and Julia Waxman, Investment in People (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1929).

[2] Bullock, A History of Negro Education, pp. 135-136.

The Negro children who were increasingly drawn into the segregated school systems of the South met a special kind of curriculum--one designed to train them more adequately for their special condition. The training in the rural schools was mainly agricultural; that in city and public schools and colleges tended more towards the industrial arts than the literary. "Hampton and Tuskegee had set the pattern. They had shown that Negro institutions of higher learning could not only win the respect of the South by their dedication to the manual arts but could use this dedication along with the splendid voices of their choral groups to elicit financial support for their programs."[2]

It should not be assumed that there were no academically oriented schools functioning for Negroes throughout this period. Although there were some, their numbers were small. According to Jones' survey based on 1910 data, only two institutions--Fisk and Howard--met the standards set by the Carnegie Foundation and the North Central Accrediting Association for collegiate-level work. A number--including Atlanta, Morehouse, Shaw, Talledega and Tougaloo--were doing some secondary and some college-level work.[1] Jones pointed out that under a liberal interpretation of college-level work, only 33 of the 653 private and state supported schools for Negroes were teaching any subjects of college level. Of the 12,726 students in total attendance at the institutions which called themselves colleges, only 1,643 were studying college level subjects, while 994 were in professional classes. The remaining 10,089 students were in elementary and secondary courses.[2] Revealing also are the figures for schools with industrial departments and those with manual training and household arts courses. Among the former were numbered 61, which included some 17,146 pupils, of whom only 5,524 were doing work above the elementary level. Among the latter were 174 institutions with 34,143 pupils, 8,548 of whom were doing work above the elementary level.[3]

---

[1] The pioneering work of Liberty H. Bailey of Cornell and especially Seaman A. Knapp provided a vital impulse for the passage of the Smith-Lever Act. See Philip Dorf, Liberty Hyde Bailey (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1956); and Joseph C. Bailey, Seaman A. Knapp: Schoolmaster of American Agriculture (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1945).

[2] Bullock, A History of Negro Education, pp. 145-146.

Negro education in the South evolved only after many compromises, political and pedagogical. The conventional wisdom of the day was conceived to ensure that the Southern Negro would not use education to challenge white political, social, or economic hegemony, as well as to guarantee that the South would have a full complement of semiliterate and semi-skilled laborers. This educational rationale had been propounded by a few idealogues; it soon came to be accepted by the majority concerned with the education of Southern Negroes. In view of this consensus, it was unlikely that the Phelps-Stokes Fund would prove to be any less a product of its times than its predecessors had been.

---

[1] Jones, Negro Education, I, 58-59.

[2] Ibid., p. 59.

[3] Ibid., pp. 85 and 87.

# CHAPTER II

# FIRST DAYS OF THE PHELPS-STOKES FUND

## The Phelps and Stokes Families

The interest of the Phelps and Stokes families in religious and social causes was well established before the turn of the twentieth century. The most distinguished--and the wealthiest--member of the two families before 1900 was Anson Greene Phelps (1781-1853), merchant and philanthropist, born at Simsbury, Connecticut, the youngest of the four sons of Thomas and Dorothy Phelps.[1] At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Phelps moved to Hartford, where he practiced the saddler's trade and, in 1806, married Olivia Egleston. Business prospered and in 1812 Phelps moved to New York City, where he associated himself with the firm of Phelps, Peck and Company, a leading importer and merchandiser of various metals. Soon the firm's operations were extended into the metal manufacturing business at Haverstraw, New York. In 1832 Anson Greene Phelps invited his two sons-in-law, William Earl Dodge and Daniel James, to join him as partners in the firm of Phelps, Dodge and Company. This firm soon expanded its interests from merchandising to manufacturing, mining and railroads, and in the middle 1830's it made a copper strike on the Naugatuk River near Birmingham, Connecticut. Phelps, Dodge and Company had been launched as a major mining concern in the United States.

---

[1] This discussion of the Phelps and Stokes families is taken from the Dictionary of American Biography, Vol. 18, pp. 66-68; and Vol. 14, pp. 525-526, 1936; Anson Phelps Stokes, Stokes Records (3 vols.; New York: Privately Printed for the Family, 1910); and Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes, in Thomas Jesse Jones, Educational Adaptions: Report of Ten Years' Work of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1910-1920 (New York: Phelps-Stokes Fund, n.d.), pp. 7-14.

Anson Greene Phelps was one of the managers of the Colonization Society of the City of New York, which was founded on January 11, 1831.[1] He was also a member, and at one time President, of the New York State Colonization Society, and belonged as well to the American Colonization Society. During the 1840's the latter, "strife-torn, debt-ridden . . . fought for its existence. Public interest had reached bottom. . . . As an effective, forceful movement African colonization was virtually dead. But despite all obstacles the parent society still labored to revive it. Under the leadership of William McLain, John B. Pinney . . . and Anson G. Phelps, the society resumed sending small groups of colonists to Liberia. . . ."[2]

When he died in 1853, Phelps left $5,000 to the New York State Colonization Society and a conditional bequest of $50,000 toward the establishment of a theological department in a college in Liberia if $100,000 could be raised for this purpose from other sources in the United States.[3] During his lifetime Anson G. Phelps had supported and at some time acted as president of the American Bible Society, the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, the American Home Missionary Society, and the New York Blind Asylum. In 1847, while Phelps was president of the New York Colonization Society, the original flag of the independent Republic of Liberia was made in Clifton Cottage on his estate at 30 Street and the East River, New York City. Ninety years later Phelps' great grandson was to be instrumental in returning a piece of this original flag to the Negro Republic. It has been stated that by his will Anson Greene Phelps left more money than any other individual had left up to that time for religious purposes in the State of New York.[1]

---

[1] Eli Seifman, "A History of the New York State Colonization Society," New York, 1966, p. 76 ff.

[2] P. J. Staudenraus, The African Colonization Movement 1816-1865 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), p. 240.

[3] Seifman, "History of New York Colonization Society," pp. 127-128.

The most noteworthy members on the other side of the family before the twentieth century were Thomas Stokes (1765-1832) and his grandson Anson Phelps Stokes (1838-1913). Thomas Stokes had been one of the thirteen founders of the London Missionary Society. After he arrived in New York City in 1789, Stokes, a merchant, became a founder and active supporter of the American Bible Society, the American Tract Society, and the American Peace Society. His son, James Boulter Stokes, married Anson Greene Phelps' daughter, Caroline, in 1837. Thomas Stokes and Anson Greene Phelps were close friends, associated in numerous charitable and religious endeavors, and the marriage of their children was, most likely, a joyous event to both families, despite the fact that Thomas Stokes did not live to see it, having died in 1832.

---

[1] Appleton's Cyclopedia of American Biography, pp. 751-752.

The first child of this marriage was Anson Phelps Stokes who, in 1861, joined Phelps, Dodge and Company as a partner, only to withdraw after several years to organize, with his father and father-in-law, the banking firm of Phelps, Stokes and Company. A vigorous advocate of free trade (in 1872 he went to Russia, where he negotiated a $5,000,000 contract for delivery of sheet iron) and civil service reform, Anson Phelps Stokes was a founder and first president of the Reform Club. An ardent anti-imperialist, he was an incorporator and president of the National Association of Anti-Imperialistic Clubs. In 1888 Stokes turned down President Grover Cleveland's offer to make him minister to Austria. His son noted that Stokes ". . . was rather the English aristocratic type with a deep interest in public affairs, especially economics and civil service." The family interest in the American Negro and Africans was sustained more by his two sisters than by Anson Phelps Stokes himself.[1]

These two sisters of Anson Phelps Stokes were Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes (1847-1927) and Caroline Phelps Stokes (1854-1909). Their interest in Africa probably dates from the active interest of their family, especially their grandparents, in the founding of the Republic of Liberia and the subsequent visits of President Roberts to their home in New York. This interest in Africa was noted early:

---

[1] Letter, Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr. to Ralph J. Bunche, August 15, 1939, Phelps-Stokes Fund file A-83(1).

> One autumn [1876 or 1877] after the family had left the camp [at Birch Island], Caroline and her sister [Olivia] remained there . . . and read aloud Stanley's book on the dark continent which was just then printed. . . . Mr. Scribner had just returned from Egypt where he met Stanley on his return from the interior and brought the MSS of the book with him. . . . Caroline had a French poodle which she named Tippu Tib.[1]

For many years the sisters took an active interest in educational developments in general and in the education of Southern Negroes in particular. In 1893 the two sisters journeyed to Tuskegee Institute for the dedication of the Phelps Bible Training School and from there went to visit the new Negro elementary school at Calhoun, Alabama. In 1896 they returned to Tuskegee to attend the Negro Conference and to select a site for the new chapel, for which they would donate the funds. Once again they went to Calhoun, and in her diary Caroline noted that

> we were glad to find that it would be possible to visit what may be considered a grandchild of Old Hampton, the Calhoun Settlement, established a few years ago by Miss [Charlotte] Thorn and Miss [Mabel] Dillingham . . . in the heart of the "Black Belt. . . ." One cannot be long at Calhoun without recognizing the same earnest, self-sacrificing spirit that has made Hampton and Tuskegee what they are. Here, too, General Armstrong's life has been an inspiration, and his memory is tenderly cherished. . . .[2]

In 1898 Caroline endowed the Roberts Memorial Scholarship at Tuskegee in honor of the first president of the Liberian Republic. And in 1901 Dorothy Hall, an industrial building for girls, was dedicated at

---

[1] Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes, "The Story of Caroline Phelps Stokes" (Lenox, Massachusetts, 1927), p. 71 (Typewritten.)

[2] Quoted from ibid., pp. 260-263.

Tuskegee, due to the beneficience of Caroline Phelps Stokes. In a rather veiled allusion to Caroline and Olivia Phelps Stokes Booker T. Washington, who was in their New York home often, says in his autobiography that ". . . there are two ladies in New York, whose names rarely appear in print, but who, in a quiet way, have given us the means to erect three large and important buildings during the last eight years. Besides the gift of these buildings, they have made other generous donations to the school. . . ."[1]

Caroline Phelps Stokes' interest in education was only approached by her interest in the problem of housing. "All this winter [1902] the need of better housing for the poor which Caroline was constantly considering resulted in her . . . building the Tuskegee improved tenements for colored people in one of the most crowded districts of New York where colored people congregated. . . ."[2] Caroline probably inherited this interest in housing for the poor from her father, James Stokes, who was instrumental in founding the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, and her mother, who became a stockholder of the Improved Dwellings Association when it was formed.

## The Phelps-Stokes Fund

Caroline Phelps Stokes' unexpected death in 1909 did not signal the eclipse of these interests, but rather provided for their continuance. In her will, dated June 29, 1893, Miss Stokes provided the financial backing for a Fund which would insure that her family's interest in education and housing for Negroes was forwarded.[1] Article seventeen of her will stated that:

---

[1] Washington, Up From Slavery, p. 127.

[2] Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes, "The Story of Caroline Phelps Stokes," p. 328.

> After all bequests and devices heretofore made in this will shall have been paid by my executors, I direct that all my residuary estate of whatever kind . . . shall be given by my Executors to the following persons or such of them as may be living at the time of my death whom with their successors I appoint trustees[2] to hold the same in trust forever to constitute a fund known as the Phelps-Stokes Fund, . . . to be invested and kept invested by them and their successors, the interest and net income of such fund to be used by them and their successors for the erection or improvement of tenement house dwellings in New York City for the poor families of New York City and for educational purposes in the education of Negroes both in Africa and the United States, North American Indians and needy and deserving white students, through industrial schools similar to that at Northfield, Massachusetts . . . or the Peet Industrial School at Asheville, North Carolina, the foundation of scholarships and the erection and endowment of school buildings or chapels. . . .

In addition to establishing the first Fund devoted almost exclusively to the welfare of the black man and providing a generous legacy for many members of her large family, Caroline Phelps Stokes left $10,000 each to the Burnham Industrial School, Canaan, New York; the Calhoun

---

[1] A complete copy of this will is appended to the official Minutes of the Executive Committee and the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund. (Typewritten.)

[2] Names as trustees were the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of New York City; the Chancellor of the University of the City of New York; the Reverend Dr. Lyman Abbott of Brooklyn; Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes; Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes; Helen Olivia Phelps Stokes, Francis L. Slade, Mabel Slade, Caroline M. Phelps Stokes, Grace H. Dodge, and Arthur James Curtiss.

Colored School, Calhoun, Alabama; and Hampton Institute. These three institutions had one thing in common--they were vocationally-oriented schools. The phrase 'through industrial schools' in article seventeen of the will was destined to play a large role in the direction in which the Phelps-Stokes Fund subsequently moved.

The first meeting of the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund was held on April 28, 1910, at the home of Anson Phelps Stokes who, although not a Trustee, was an executor of his sister's will.[1] Mr. Wyckoff, as attorney for the Executors, stated that the Phelps-Stokes Fund would amount to approximately $800,000, and presented the legal status of the trust. The resignations of three of the Trustees named in the will--Arthur James Curtiss, Reverend Lyman Abbott, and Mabel Slade Arbuthrot--were accepted.[2] Elected to fill one of these vacancies was Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., nephew of Caroline Phelps Stokes. Stokes, Jr. was duly elected Secretary of the Fund, with the understanding that he would not have to conduct correspondence other than the Secretary's work connected with the recording of minutes of the meetings. The Trustees then appointed a Committee on Plan and Scope to make recommendations for the Fund's organization. The members of this Committee were: Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes, Chairman;

---

[1] Minutes of the Executive Committee and the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, April 18, 1910.

[2] Harlan, Separate and Unequal, p. 80, quotes Abbott, upon returning from an Ogden railroad journey to the South in 1901, as saying that "we have to get rid of our more or less vague idea that all men are created equal."

Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes; F. L. Slade, Helen Olivia Phelps Stokes; and Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr.[1]

Meetings of this Committee were held on November 14 and December 27, 1910, and on May 1, 1911. The Trustees met on May 24, 1911, to consider the report of the Committee which, in addition to recommending that the Executive Committee appoint a Committee on Education and a Committee on Housing, informed those present that an act to incorporate the trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund had been introduced into the New York State Legislature at Albany on February 6 and had been signed into law by the governor on May 10, 1911.[2] The act of incorporation, in addition to granting those powers stipulated in the will, provided that

> . . . It shall be within the purpose of said corporation to use any means to such ends [erection of tenements and educating of Africans, American Negroes, American Indians and deserving white students through industrial schools, as well as founding of scholarships, and erection or endowment of school buildings or chapels] which shall from time to time seem expedient to the members of the trustees including research, publication, the establishment and maintenance of charitable or benevolent activities, agencies and institutions, and the aid of any such activities, agencies or institutions already established.[3]

The Treasurer, Francis L. Slade, then presented a report indicating that the Phelps-Stokes Fund could expect to derive an annual income of approximately $37,000 from its principal, which just exceeded $800,000. This was followed by an informal report by Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., outlining some of the considerations to be borne in mind in connection with the gifts made by the Fund for educational purposes. The following suggestions, later adopted by the Trustees as policy, were made in this preliminary memorandum on the educational work of the Phelps-Stokes Fund:[1]

---

[1] Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes and F. L. Slade were nephews and Helen Olivia Phelps Stokes a niece of Caroline Phelps Stokes.

[2] Minutes of the Executive Committee and the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, May 24, 1911.

[3] An Act to incorporate the trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, February 6, 1911, Chapter 123 of the Laws of 1911 of the State of New York, nos. 257, 619, 734.

> 1) That in providing for the establishment of the Phelps-Stokes Fund the testator showed a special, although by no means exclusive interest, in negro education.
> 2) That it is wise for the Board to disperse its philanthropy as far as possible through existing institutions of proven experience and of assurance of future stability.
> 3) That the co-operation of the best white citizens of the South is of prime importance in solving the problem of negro education.
> 4) That the Board will be justified in meeting occasionally the whole or a part of the expense of securing investigation and reports on educational institutions or problems, when these are thought to be of great significance.

In closing Stokes spoke of the possibility of aiding the Jeanes Fund in the employment of county supervisors of Negro schools, of carrying on similar work for certain private schools under the direction of Hampton and Tuskegee, and of supporting James H. Dillard's plan for a conference of Southern State university presidents to consider the subject of Negro education.

Before the year was out the Phelps-Stokes Fund had made several important policy decisions as well as its first allocations for education. Among the former can be numbered the decision of November 15, 1911, to set aside one-third of the net income accumulated to date and one-third of the net income for the fiscal year beginning November 1, 1911, for housing purposes in connection with future recommendations of the sub-committee on housing, and to set aside two-thirds for educational purposes to be decided upon by the Board.[1] Of equal importance was the appointment of Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., as a member of the Committee on Education. Upon his recommendation the Trustees voted to grant the Jeanes Fund $2,500 to provide salaries for county supervisors of Negro schools in the South, the first educational allocation of the Fund.

---

[1] Minutes of the Executive Committee and the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, May 24, 1911.

At this same meeting the Trustees voted to grant $12,500 each to the Universities of Georgia and Virginia towards the establishment of fellowships for the study of the Negro. This was done because the Trustees, mindful of Caroline Phelps Stokes' interest in improving the condition of the Negro, felt that "one of the best methods of forwarding this purpose is to provide means to enable the southern youth of broad sympathies to make a scientific study of the negro and of his adjustment to American civilization."[2] Under the terms of the grant, each university was to appoint annually a Fellow in Sociology for the

---

[1] Minutes of the Executive Committee and Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, November 15, 1911.

[2] *Ibid.*

Study of the Negro. He was to pursue advanced studies under the auspices of the department of sociology, economics, education, or history, and would receive an annual stipend of $500.00. Each Fellow was to prepare a report embodying the results of his investigation, which would be published by the university with the assistance of the Phelps-Stokes Fund.

The Trustees voted these initial grants for education almost solely on the recommendations of Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., who brought to the Fund considerable expertise in educational finance. Stokes was born at New Brighton, Staten Island, New York, on April 13, 1874, the fifth child of Anson Phelps and Helen Louisa Stokes. He made the first of several European trips with his family in the summer of 1886.[1] The greater part of 1891 was spent in Europe studying French, in which he already had a grounding thanks to the omnipresence of a French governess in the Stokes household, and German. The next year he entered Yale University as an undergraduate, beginning an association which was to last some twenty-five years.

In 1899, while finishing his Divinity course at the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, he became Secretary of Yale, a position which he held until 1921, and, at the same time, the Assistant Minister of St. Paul's Church in New Haven.

Although he had visited Hampton Institute when approximately eight years old and had heard much from his two aunts, it was not until he joined Robert C. Ogden, who had played such an instrumental role in the planning of Negro education,[1] on a southern trip in 1905 that his interest in the Negro and his education began to take root. He was specially impressed by the Commencement exercises at Tuskegee and "talks with open-minded Southern people led [him] to realize the difficulty and delicacy of the situation. . . ."[2] The 'delicacy' of the situation dictated moderation, compromise, tact, and realism, all qualities which distinguished Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr.

---

[1] Anson Phelps Stokes, "Reminiscences of Anson Phelps Stokes, 1874-1954" (Lenox, Massachusetts, 1956), p. 40a. (Typewritten.)

In 1912 Stokes was elected a member of the General Education Board, a position which he held until 1932 and which brought him into close touch with the problem of Negro education in the South. At the death of Hollis B. Frissell in 1917, he was invited to become Principal of Hampton Institute, but declined in favor of remaining at Yale. In 1924 he became a trustee of Tuskegee Institute, a connection which led him to write two short books concerning the work there.[3] During this same year he also became a canon of Washington Cathedral. His family heritage as well as his own catholic interests and abilities suited him admirably to take up his task with the Phelps-Stokes Fund, an organization with which he was to be connected as Secretary and later as President until his retirement in 1946.

---

[1] See p. 40 above, and footnote 1, p. 41.

[2] Anson Phelps Stokes, "Reminiscences," p. 40a.

[3] A Brief Biography of Booker Washington (Hampton: Hampton Institute Press, 1936); and Tuskegee Institute--The First Fifty Years (Tuskegee: Tuskegee Institute Press, 1931).

If Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr. was to the manor born, the same can hardly be said of the individual who became associated with him and the Fund in 1912 and whose influence was to play the paramount role in shaping the Fund's activities for the next thirty-four years. Thomas Jesse Jones was born in Llanfachraeth, a small rural village on the Isle of Anglesey, North Wales, in 1873. There he lived until 1884, when his family sailed for the United States, following a pattern established by his aunts and uncles, some of whom had immigrated to America as early as 1850.[1] In fact, Jones' mother, with her family of four, was the last of nine brothers and sisters to sail for the United States. They settled in the small southern Ohio town of Greenfield, amongst coal miners and iron workers who years before had migrated from Germany and Wales. Upon arrival young Jones spoke only Welsh, the exclusive language of Llanfachraeth. America was the land of hope to which his aunts and uncles had been going for thirty-five years; however, before this Utopia would be realized for the young immigrant, there were destined to be many years of adjustment, "somesometimes irritating and sometimes otherwise."

In 1891 he entered Washington and Lee University in Lexington, Virginia, "where the ideals of these two cultivated southern founders were personified in faculty and students."[1] However, he remained in this bastion of Southern traditionalism for only two years, transferring to Marietta College in Ohio, from which he received his Bachelor of Arts degree in 1897. He entered Columbia University the next year and earned the Master of Arts degree in 1899, his thesis being entitled "Social Phases of Education in the Elementary Schools," a study based upon his experience as a secondary school teacher of economics and history and upon investigations of elementary schools and the preparation of teachers. This work was done simultaneously with his course at Union Theological Seminary, from which he received the Bachelor of Divinity degree in 1900. In that year he was awarded the Fellowship in Sociology at Columbia University, and the following year was spent in a study of sociological methods of investigation and in their application to the study of an urban community. His interest in sociology and its relation to economics was strong, and while studying at Union Theological Seminary he managed to take almost one-fourth of his total courses in these two disciplines, ones rarely associated with divinity training at the turn of the century.[2]

---

[1] Thomas Jesse Jones, "Interracial Experiences and Observations," Phelps-Stokes Fund A-19. See also Jones, Essentials of Civilization (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1929), pp. xi, xii. These have been supplemented by conversations with his daughter, Carolyn Jones Williams of Middletown, Pennsylvania.

While studying at Columbia and Union Theological from 1898 to 1900 he was a non-resident worker at the Union Settlement in New York City, and after completing his studies he became acting headworker of the University Settlement. While holding this position he edited the annual report of the Settlement for 1902, a collection of brief monographs on urban conditions. Later that year he went to Hampton Institute where, in addition to acting as the chaplain and part-time instructor, he was the director of the research department. Two years later his doctoral dissertation, entitled *The Sociology of a New York City Block*,[1] was accepted by Columbia University.

---

[1] Jones, Essentials of Civilization, p. xii.

[2] I am indebted to the Registrar of Union Theological Seminary for this information.

His work as a non-resident worker at the Union Settlement was devoted to the study of people living in the neighboring tenement houses as well as in various tenement districts of New York City. This initial interest, coupled with his more intensive study during six months as a resident worker at the Union Settlement, evolved into *The Sociology of a New York City Block*, which was the detailed study of tenement people on one block near the settlement. Some years later, commenting on his reasons for taking up residence in a settlement, Jones remarked that

> it was primarily my conviction that education and altruistic service should be based upon actual conditions of community life. So much of education, religious and general social work have long seemed to me artificial owing to the fact that it is not based upon a vital awareness of the life of the people. Association with settlements . . . seems a most effective means of learning the life of the people. . . .[2]

---

[1] Published under this title by Columbia University Press, 1904.

[2] Letter, Jones to Caroline Hill, March 3, 1926, Phelps-Stokes Fund file A-22(3). The relationship between social settlements, education, and community betterment at the period during which Jones was actively engaged is discussed in Cremin, *The Transformation of the School*, pp. 58-65.

This theme of relating education to the actual conditions of community life was to form the cornerstone of Jones' educational philosophy.

The years between his entry into Columbia University and his departure from Hampton Institute in 1909 mark the formative period of Jones' philosophy of education. Once removed from Hampton with his philosophy crystallized, he embarked upon a program of implementation which was to gain him recognition from South Africa to Arizona and from Greece to the Gold Coast. Jones' educational philosophy remained remarkably consistent for the thirty-five years he espoused it, and a glance at it at this juncture might be instructive.[1]

## Thomas Jesse Jones' Educational Philosophy

At the heart of this philosophy was the concept that education must be more comprehensive than the three R's; it must be more in quantity and still more in quality. The individual must receive an education not for today or tomorrow, but for life--for his life and for that of the community. Education for the fullness of life required a much more vital educational reform than that of accretion. The metamorphosis must be internal, not external, and must be directed and inspired by a new attitude.

Jones' study of the tenement districts of New York City and his

---

[1] Jones' philosophy of education is set down most succinctly in his Four Essentials of Education (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926), and the more comprehensive Essentials of Civilization. Except where otherwise noted, the following discussion is taken from these two works.

70

residence in the University Settlement surely formed a watershed in his evolving philosophy. A look at the schools in the tenement districts appalled him; there he saw teachers who had no understanding of the milieu in which they worked. "The chief defect of all the schools is the inability of officers and teachers to understand the different types of nationality and to supply the needs of each type."[1] The only way to understand and properly teach these differing ethnic groups was to study the prevailing traits of the children and then adapt the education provided to the needs of the individual and the community as conditions warranted.[2]

Jones isolated four elements, his four Essentials or Simples, which he felt were the true objectives of all education for life. Universal in their application, the four Essentials were the key to individual and community growth and prosperity. They were, first, health and sanitation; second, the appreciation and use of the environment, both material and human; third, the effective development of the home and household; and fourth, recreation and culture--physical, mental, and spiritual. Once the teacher had a full consciousness of the community in which he served, he should set about to teach the four Essentials of education.

If Jones felt that he had little hope of implementing these recommendations amidst the stuffy tenements of New York City, he certainly found the air much fresher and the soil more fertile for the cultivation of his ideas when he arrived at Hampton in 1902. There he could readily identify with Armstrong's educational ideals and felt that the possibility was at hand for his own ideas to come to fruition. Jones held Armstrong in high esteem, and the extent of the General's influence on Jones' evolving philosophy can perhaps be discerned from the following passage:

---

[1] Jones, The Sociology of a New York City Block, p. 119.

[2] Ibid., pp. 132-133.

> The masses must be educated if they are to be citizens of our nation--the masses ought to be educated if they are children of God and possess undying souls. Our ideal is the Christian Democracy, in which the industrial system, the Government, the schools, and the churches are all working to elevate and to beautify the soul of the individual, while the individual is working with head, heart, and hand to establish the Kingdom of God upon this Earth. . . .[1]

The religious overtones and near missionary fervor were to remain a distinct characteristic of his educational philosophy.

By 1906 Jones, after assiduously studying the environs, had arrived at a number of conclusions, one of which concerned the Negro and agriculture:

> The study of the distribution of colored and Indian populations showing that a large majority of these races are living in country districts and are immediately dependent upon farming makes the great importance of a knowledge of agriculture quite apparent. . . . This importance is emphasized by the fact that rural life offers the freedom of activity necessary to the development of a people in the process of

---

[1] Sermon entitled "The Fatherhood of God in Relation to Democracy," delivered by Jones, February 1, 1903, at Hampton Institute.

> assimilating the customs of another people. The rural process is slower but is attended with less irritation. . . .[1]

While one can hardly dispute his contention that those who were immediately dependent on farming should be better versed in the rudiments of scientific agricultural methods, his argument that the rural setting was more condusive to the process of assimilation is open to some question. Although he was trained in the contemporary sociological methodology, his training did not prevent him from occasionally basing a conclusion on something less than empirical data. If he believed that a rural setting was more condusive to the process of assimilation for people who needed acculturizing into the American milieu, then we could expect that he would advocate the rural settling of most of the Irish and Italian, not to mention Eastern European, immigrants who flocked to America after the Civil War. But there is no evidence of this.

The rural setting of Hampton afforded Jones the opportunity to study the problems faced by Negro farmers, as the classroom contact afforded him the opportunity to study the effects of the Hampton educational experience on an underprivileged people. For Jones, sociology was basically the study of people rather than of institutions. If the researcher did not fully understand the people with whom he was dealing, no meaningful observations or recommendations could be made. Implicit in this was the ability of the researcher to empathise, a trait in which Jones was singularly lacking.[1]

---

[1] Jones, "Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum: Economics and Material Welfare," The Southern Workman, XXXV (February, 1906), 115.

Despite this, his close scrutiny of conditions in the urban setting of New York and the more idyllic setting of Hampton did provide him with the ingredients from which he could forge his educational philosophy. In both places he found people out of the mainstream of American life; people who, either because of enslavement or cultural or religious differences, were having difficulty adjusting to the new society in which they lived; people who needed some specific program to help acculturize them to the American milieu so that they would not be excluded from the swelling middle stream of American life. The immigrant groups of New York brought with them their Old World heritages and cultures, and before they could be transformed into

---

[1] To James H. Dillard, Jones wrote, March 28, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund C-9, ". . . what do you think of 'Conflict Complex' as a phrase to describe the Negro intelligentsia's frame of mind? . . . The research propositions of the National Interracial Conference . . . mentioned are as follows: Peonage, Disenfranchisement, Lynching, Law forbidding Intermarriage, Forced Labor--all conflict topics. The only normal topics mentioned seemingly as a minority afterthought were: Agricultural conditions, group formation, and Leadership among Negroes. This overemphasis on Conflict seems to me to characterize the attitude of Negro intelligentsia and many of their friends."

Apparently, Jones could not understand why the Negro intelligentsia was so disturbed about lynching, disenfranchisement, and the whole gamut of grievances faced by the Negro, any Negro, in the United States in the 1920's. But then he was in no danger of being lynch or disenfranchised; nor could he really understand the humiliations which were the common lot of the Negro. Not facing these immediate dangers, Jones could sympathize to a degree (just so long as it did not put him out) but could not empathise, and this inability caused him to accuse those for whom they were matters of pressing concern of having a 'Conflict Complex.' For a discussion of the conditions under which Southern Negroes lived in the early twentieth century, see Ray Stannard Baker, Following the Color Line (New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1908).

Americans they had to be shorn of their Italian, Irish, or Polish mannerisms. With the Southern Negro, however, the problem was somewhat different, for it was popularly assumed that he had neither heritage nor culture. Since he was regarded, in essence, as a *tabula rasa*, the need was not so great to remake him as to inculcate in him both the heritage and culture which were lacking. Here was a situation ripe for educational innovation, and it was into this void that Thomas Jesse Jones moved with his educational philosophy.

But as he said of this philosophy, "these thoughts are not new. They have been gathered from many sources. They seem so obvious as to be the possession of the ages."[1] The American antecedents of his ideas will be mentioned below; of more immediate relevance is the fact that Jones' educational principles began to gain attention just at the time when the protracted conflict between the vocational-school and the liberal arts-school of thought regarding Negro education was drawing to a close. "These thoughts," of course, were Jones four Simples of education. They, in turn, were based on his theory of educational adaptation, which he defined as the accommodation of either an institution or a school system to the needs and conditions of the individuals and their community. His four Simples had evolved out of his own study and experiences and were so obvious to him that he could not understand why they had not been implemented for all Negro education long before. Armstrong's work at Hampton had defined a course with which Jones concurred most heartily; Jones merely set about to reinforce and modify these ideas to fit his own scheme.

---

[1] Letter, Jones to J. H. Oldham, March 28, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file L-1.

All school subjects and activities had to make their contribution to education for life; it could not be confined to a single course or to a series of lectures. The objective of education for life, in Jones' final analysis, was to make men and women true Christians and true democrats, with the implication that this duality would help to raise men's living standards as well as to make them more aware of their Christian duty to their neighbors. His belief in the efficacy of Christian Democracy, resting on the foundation of laissez-faire economics and his four Simples, was unwavering.

The old school subjects were no longer relevant to the life of the twentieth century. The old civics, for instance, almost exclusively a study of government machinery, must give way to the new civics, a study of all manner of social efforts to improve mankind. To this end social science in the high school had a great contribution to make and should include the observation and study of such topics as community health, housing and homes, public recreation, good roads, poverty and the care of the poor, human and material resources, and family income. The importance lay not in giving the student an exhaustive knowledge of any one of these areas, but rather in giving him a clue to the significance of these matters for him and for his community, and to arouse in him a desire to know more about his environment.[1] It was far more important to train boys and girls in citizenship--that amorphous panacea for society's ills--than in mathematics, botany, literature, science, or any of the orthodox school subjects. The trend towards individualism--so encouraged by contemporary education--should be diverted, and students must understand that it has become impossible for them to separate their interests from those of the community.

Jones felt that his first essential, health, was a sine qua non for any society. If a people are not healthy, then all their natural resources, their accumulated traditions, history, music, and science are rendered inefficient because of their inability to utilize these resources fully. Jones obviously came into contact with a considerable amount of disease in his study of the New York tenements, as well as witnessing the ravages of hookworm and kindred disabilities in the Hampton area, and there is good reason to believe that these experiences accounted in large measure for the adoption of this first Simple.

Whether in a non-technical or technologically-oriented society, appreciation and use of the environment, Jones' second Simple, was vital to effective education. Courses which had a direct bearing upon the environment, e.g., manual training, domestic science, agricultural instruction and practice, applied science, should form an integral part of the school curriculum. The school aims, policies, and methods must be reorganized and adapted to meet the needs of the environment in which it is located, be it urban or rural.

---

[1] "Social Study Movement Is Outlined," The Salt Lake Evening Telegram, July 10, 1913.

This consciousness of the environment will lead to the recognition of the importance of agriculture to both city and rural youth, more especially the latter. These will learn to appreciate the essential value of their agricultural surroundings to all society. "They will thus carry on the realities of education as they were organized by the pioneers of rural America in their struggle with nature."[1] Another result of the appreciation and use of the environment will be a better understanding of the value of industrial training and the processes of physical science. "The increase of industrial and technical schools is . . . inspired by a broad conception of the intimate and real relation of industrial activities to the mental, moral and social progress of humanity."[2]

The effective development of the home and household, the third Simple, should also be nurtured in school. The school curriculum should continue its work in home economics and household arts for the girls and should initiate kindred courses for the boys. The whole school should be regarded as an expression of home life and, since every educational stage has some contribution to make to the knowledge and training required for home life, education for home and household should not be assigned exclusively to special courses, but should be, as far as possible, an integral part of every course.

---

[1] Jones, Four Essentials of Education, p. 83.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 84.

The fourth Simple, recreation, was propounded by Jones as early as 1904.[1] Man must know how to turn aside and rest a while. To rest was not to rust away in selfish indulgence or wicked thought; on the contrary, it is "to re-create ourselves at our weakest points," to fill in the gaps by complementary effort. Recreation must be a concern of every phase of education. Attitudes towards recreation should be inculcated in every school course; indeed, to be successfully implemented, recreation must be an integral part of each subject offered. For instance, "literature and foreign languages will introduce pupils to an extensive field of recreational experiences, including the informative and inspirational presentations of the great classics in all the languages learned. . . ."[2]

This last Simple, almost mystical in its obscurity, had strong religious overtones. By playing with a hyphen in the word, Jones could make recreation assume reproductive proportions, a physiological function which held a spiritual connotation for him. He felt that if he could win the attention of the non-religious world with the phrase "recreation and culture," he could then lead the non-believers "on to a recognition of religion as the most powerful and most real means of re-creating humanity."[1] This emphasis on spiritual regeneration, coupled with the belief that education without Christianity was a logical contradiction, was to form a marked characteristic of Jones' later approach to African education.

---

[1] Sermon entitled "Recreation," delivered July 6, 1904, at Hampton.

[2] Jones, Four Essentials of Education, pp. 175-176.

What he was really urging "was a new attitude based upon a genuine awareness of community life,"[2] with the four Simples at the core of the school curriculum. He was fearful that the progressive methods of research, which seemed to be so analytical, tended to overlook the simple Essentials which were so necessary to a true understanding of conditions.[3] He became increasingly convinced that "the best way 'to research' is to go and do something constructive."[4] Research for its own sake was anathema.

Jones felt that his educational philosophy was universally applicable and, despite appearances to the contrary, not designed just for peoples in special circumstances. But his arguments were not always convincing. The opposition to the four Simples and their implications (or what were deemed such) was often strong. Jones understood the reasons for this reluctance to accept his gospel and noted that only when Europe and America gave the Simples "their proper place in our educational and religious development" would the underdeveloped world follow suit.[1] Education had been adapted before, and Jones was certain that it could, and must, be adapted to a much greater degree. He discerned harbingers of the adaptive principle in certain areas of the United States. ". . . Our middle west interest in education is much more practical than that of our eastern states. The contrast is even greater between the artificialities of European education and the realities of our middle west schools, especially those of our Agricultural colleges."[2] It was these realities, these factors which were related to the everyday business of living, which were the basis of his educational philosophy. Irrelevant education could be as socially dysfunctional as it was spiritually void because it would train youth to become individualists, more interested in furthering their own ends than those of their fellows. It was this philosophy, stressing the realities of life (epitomized by the four Simples and emphasis on industrial and agricultural training) as opposed to the artificialities of education (with its emphasis on literary training and the ideas concomitant with that system), which Jones advocated with great vigor for many years after his departure from Hampton Institute in 1909.

---

[1] Letter, Jones to C. T. Loram, November 25, 1925, Phelps-Stokes Fund file N-14.

[2] Letter, Jones to James Barton, March 14, 1929, Phelps-Stokes Fund file A-22(1).

[3] Letter, Jones to Wallace Buttrick, December 8, 1925, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-3.

[4] Letter, Jones to James H. Dillard, September 3, 1931, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-9.

---

[1] Letter, Jones to J. H. Oldham, June 15, 1926, Phelps-Stokes Fund file L-1.

[2] Letter, Jones to Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., November 30, 1925, Phelps Stokes Fund file K-10.

Jones would have reacted with incredulity had he been informed that his educational philosophy was, to a large degree, consonant with that propounded by some heralds of the Progressive Education Movement during the first years of the twentieth century. He frequently expressed opposition to the "progressive conventions of education in the United States [which] are too strong," mainly because "some of the trends seem . . . to be counteracting the moves that have made Negro education notable for its effectiveness." He felt the work of the General Education Board under the leadership of Wallace Buttrick and of Hollis B. Frissell at Hampton had proved their efficacy, and urged that these experiences be accepted and adapted for the relief of people everywhere.[1]

Jones often voiced his belief in the relationship between agriculture and spiritual regeneration. Those who worked the soil were closer to God and, consequently, possessed greater morality. In this he was merely echoing Liberty Hyde Bailey of the Cornell University Agriculture School, who felt that "the farmer would continue to be the 'moral mainstay' of the nation."[2] By 1900 Bailey had succeeded in establishing Cornell as the headquarters for hundreds of nature-study clubs which, he believed, would be the panacea for the alienation of man from the land and from his neighbors. "Children who studied the Creator's work first-hand would hardly join the flight to the artificialities of the city."[1] Bailey charged that traditional schools had isolated themselves from the community, "dealing with time-honored irrelevancies bearing little relation to agriculture." These methods must be abandoned. The school "must be broad rather than narrow, spontaneous rather than formal. Most important, it must be of, by, and for the country, _oriented to rural needs, concerned with rural problems, seeking at every juncture to cultivate a love of agriculture and the land_."[2] To this Jones surely would have uttered a hardy 'amen.'

---

[1] Letter, Jones to J. H. Oldham, May 27, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-5.

[2] Cremin, The Transformation of the School, p. 76.

Jones did not understand that he was part of a movement whose tenets he professed to abhor.[3] This is illustrated by the fact that progressive education had, according to one observer,[4] no greater apostles than Dr. Seaman A. Knapp of the Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Work and Dr. Wallace Buttrick of the General Education Board, two of Jones' heroes. In 1904, working with the Department of Agriculture, Knapp organized some 7,000 demonstrations of the latest scientific methods of farming in the rural South. The next year he met Buttrick, and the General Education Board soon joined the Department of Agriculture in sponsoring Knapp's demonstration work.[1] In the ensuing years Jones incorporated the basic philosophy of Knapp's demonstration work into his own educational creed.

---

[1] Cremin, _The Transformation of the School_, p. 77.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 78. Italics added.

[3] Jones noted that the progressives, "largely represented by the Teachers College type, are more or less removed from the life of the people" and, he implied, wreaking havoc with their fancy and outmoded ideas. Letter, Jones to James H. Dillard, April 17, 1925, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-9(1).

[4] Cremin, _The Transformation of the School_, pp. 80-81.

Cremin notes[2] that progressive education was "a many-sided effort to use the schools to improve the lives of individuals." But if the work of Knapp, Bailey, and Buttrick could also be included under the rubric of progressive education, it would be erroneous to assume that the movement was restricted to the school in its traditional edifice. Within the institutional framework, however, progressive education fit into three divisions: (1) the broadening of the program and function of the school to include direct concern for health, vocation, and the quality of family and community life; (2) the application in the classroom of the pedagogical principles derived from the new scientific research in psychology and the social sciences; and (3) the tailoring of instruction more and more to the different kinds and classes of children who were being brought within the purview of the school.

Jones' four Simples were obviously derived from the first category, while his principle of adaptation can be traced to the third. The second he ignored, for he felt that "educational policies formulated on the basis of principles of school administration and psychological researches, both of which are more or less removed from

---

[1] Cremin, The Transformation of the School, p. 81.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. viii-ix.

84

the life of the people," had no intrinsic pedagogical merit.[1]

When he noted that the thoughts which characterized his educational philosophy were not new,[2] he spoke without an awareness that his ideas were congruous with a larger movement in American educational history. What did make his particular ideology noteworthy, however, was not so much its consonance with the Progressive Education Movement, as the manner in which he would later distort what were basically liberal doctrines so that they were metamorphosized into a reactionary rationale to perpetuate a caste system both in the Southern United States and in Africa.

Jones' first contact with the Phelps-Stokes Fund was not until 1912, by which time the official policy of the Fund was fairly well established. That policy, as suggested by Anson Phelps Stokes, was obviously influenced by the modus operandi of the General Education Board and the Jeanes Fund, as well as Stokes' own intuition and experience. Well aware of the controversy between the Washington and DuBois factions, Stokes made the following evaluation some fifty years after the initial conflict between the Negro leaders was joined:

> I happened to know intimately the two greatest leaders at the time of the controversy over Negro education, Booker Washington . . . and Dr. DuBois. Both made their contribution of importance, but considering the time and

---

[1] Letter, Jones to James H. Dillard, September 17, 1925, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-9(1).

[2] See p. 74 above.

> place Booker Washington placed a necessary emphasis in his work at Tuskegee. . . .[1]

The second and third educational recommendations Stokes had drafted in 1911--that it is wise for the board to dispense its philanthropy as far as possible through existing institutions of proven experience and of assured future stability, and that the cooperation of the best white citizens of the South is of prime importance in solving the problem of Negro education--ensured that the Phelps-Stokes Fund would follow in the path trodden by its sister foundations, particularly the General Education Board and the Jeanes Fund, and would be a proponent of the 'special education' theory. In retrospect, Anson Phelps Stokes felt that "this plan was a wise one, at best to meet the conditions of the time."[2] The conditions of the times (interpreted by a few influential groups and individuals) dictated the policies of the times concerning Negro education in the South, and this assured that it was to be in the vocational vein, especially for the black masses. If there is some evidence to lead one to ascribe ulterior motives to several proponents of this theory (particularly those who had vested commercial interests), there is no evidence of this sort to level against Stokes. Ignorant, by his own admission, of the problem of Negro education in the South until his 1905 trip South with the Ogden party, he most probably believed that the educational theory already espoused was the most efficacious for the obstacles presented. Anson Phelps Stokes was not a prophet, but a product of his times. Even if he had not been, it is doubtful that he could have done much to turn the tide by the time the Phelps-Stokes Fund was incorporated in 1911.

---

[1] Anson Phelps Stokes, "Reminiscences," p. 101.

[2] Ibid., p. 99.

Although he consistently stressed his belief in the inherent potential of the Negro, he coupled this with enough caveats to ensure that he did not alienate the white ruling oligarchy of which he was a member. For instance, as late as 1939, while stating his belief that "white and colored people . . . all go back to the same human stock and that there is nothing which should prevent their working together harmoniously," he noted that, "in the interests of race pride . . . the system of separate social life of different racial groups is normally advisable." Interracial and interdenominational cooperation he firmly advocated, but he did "not believe that intermarriages between any widely separated racial groups is generally advisable."[1] Thus, while he did advocate interracial cooperation and fought long and hard for improved social opportunities for the Negro, Stokes fell far short of advocating equality. On the edge of the precipice, he, like so many of his peers, bowed to the prevailing social climate of the day and refused to attempt to leap across.

Stokes' approach to racial problems was of a quiet, non-propagandistic nature and for the times in which he labored he was considered, to borrow Harlan's phrase, a moderate progressive.[1] He wanted the Phelps-Stokes Fund to go about its work as unobtrusively and effectively as possible. The best way to achieve this goal was to be non-controversial; and the only way to be non-controversial was to work within the existing framework rather than battering at the ramparts. And, besides, there is no evidence to suggest that Stokes doubted the conventional wisdom of the early 1900's concerning Negro education. Those who shaped it could hardly be accused (except by a few 'radicals') of disingenuousness at the time, for their efforts--paternalistic and misshapen though their ideas might appear in retrospect--were almost herculean in scope. What could be more praiseworthy than a small self-sacrificing coterie of men attempting to formulate and implement an educational policy which would lift the Southern Negro out of the mire into which he had fallen? It was, after all, a very Christian thing to do and the Fund was, by Stokes' admission, "a semi-missionary organization."[2] The Fund would be non-controversial and apolitical, it would stress cooperation rather than discord, it would work with the best white citizens of the South, and

---

[1] Letter, Stokes to Ralph Bunche, August 15, 1939, Phelps-Stokes Fund file A-83(1).

---

[1] Harlan, Separate and Unequal, p. 75, defines moderate progressives as men "moderate in the North on the delicate racial and sectional issues and progressive in the South in the limited sense that [they] offered education as a key to regional progress."

[2] Letter, Stokes to Jones, November 8, 1933, Stokes Papers, Yale University.

88

would attempt to utilize its meagre resources to the best advantage of those for whom it had been established. In this work Anson Phelps Stokes and Thomas Jesse Jones were to complement one another to a remarkable degree.

# CHAPTER III

# NEGRO EDUCATION AND THE PHELPS-STOKES FUND

## The Survey of Negro Education

Aid to certain schools and institutions, as well as modes of interracial cooperation, two of the Fund's three educational emphases, were ensured by the Trustees' adoption of Stokes' first, second, and third educational recommendations. But it was the fourth recommendation[1] which, besides projecting the Fund into the national and international arena, set the stage for the entrance of Thomas Jesse Jones onto the scene.

The idea for a study of Negro education in the South was first mentioned in the autumn of 1912 and was prompted as much by the need as by the appearance of Flexner's survey of medical education in the United States and Canada two years earlier. Of the need Booker T. Washington wrote that

> It would be a matter of the greatest help to have these schools thoroughly examined with a view of letting the public know just what they are doing. This has never been done. . . . There are many so-called industrial schools that have the reputation of giving industrial training, but in fact the work is a mere sham. There are not a few institutions with the name "college" and "university" that are in fact mere local schools pretending to do college work when in reality the majority of their

---

[1] That the Board will be justified in meeting occasionally the whole or part of the expense of securing investigation and reports on educational institutions or problems, when these are thought to be of great significance.

> students are in the primary . . . grades. . . . It would help these schools more than any one single thing . . . to have them thoroughly examined and let the public know just what they are doing in much the same way that the medical schools were recently examined. . . .[1]

To lead the investigation he recommended one of his advisers, the University of Chicago sociologist, Robert E. Park, who, in addition to first suggesting the necessity of the study, would be able to produce "a broader and more comprehensive study than a professional statistician would be able to give us."[2] But Jones, the statistician, in addition to having impressive credentials, had influential allies who were to help him secure the position.

When he left Hampton in 1909, Jones had gone to the United States Bureau of the Census "in order that we might secure more reliable statistics of the negroes in this country."[3] He moved to the Bureau of Education when Congress reduced the appropriations for this work. Frissell, Hampton's principal, favored Jones for the impending survey because he felt that a Welshman, educated partly in the South and partly in the North with experience in the Census Bureau and a position in the Bureau of Education would have a chance to get information such as would hardly be possible for a man in any other position. J. H. Dillard of the Jeanes and Slater Funds was also favorable to Jones' candidacy.[1]

---

[1] Letter, Washington to Anson Phelps Stokes, November 1, 1912, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-35.

[2] Letter, Washington to Stokes, November 9, 1912, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-35. One observer feels that Washington wanted Park to conduct the survey because "there were signs that Tuskegee itself was coming in for criticism by academics because its type of education was not preparing its students for life in a changing world." Washington felt that Park would overlook this; however, as he did not yet know Jones, he could not be so sanguine about him. See Charles Flint Kellogg, NAACP, A History of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored Poeple (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1967), pp. 85-86.

[3] Letter, Hollis B. Frissell to Stokes, October 31, 1912, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-35.

In addition to his influential advocates Jones had the advantage that his connection with the Bureau of Education would probably facilitate some form of cooperation with the Phelps-Stokes Fund, which did not want to commit itself to an unlimited expenditure on this project. To this end, the United States Commissioner of Education informed Stokes that if the Phelps-Stokes Fund would pay the salaries and traveling expenses of the principal investigator and two other workers, the Bureau of Education would employ them at the nominal sum of one dollar a year each. They would then be considered employees of the Bureau, and as such would have office space, telephone service, stationery, the mailing frank, and other facilities of the Bureau. The Bureau would agree to print the necessary questionnaires and to publish and distribute as bulletins the results of the investigations. In a postscript, he too endorsed Jones for the job.[2] At its meeting on November 25, 1912, the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund voted to authorize the Committee on Education to appoint an agent at a salary of $3,500 per annum to make a field study of Negro education and voted to appropriate a sum not exceeding $4,500 per annum for travel and other expenses. The Trustees further instructed the Committee to make all arrangements for the proposed survey, including possible cooperation with the Bureau of Education.[1]

---

[1] Letter, Dillard to Stokes, November 15, 1912, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-35.

[2] P. P. Claxton to Stokes, November 19, 1912, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-35.

Jones began his work for the Phelps-Stokes Fund on the Negro education survey in January, 1913. Like Stokes, he was concerned that the investigating team should have some semblance of racial balance. Ocea Taylor, a Negro born in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, and a graduate of Howard University was the first addition to the team. Because he was black, Jones felt that Taylor would "not only discover many facts not available to a white man but he would make it possible for the white investigator to avoid situations which might arouse antagonisms in the South."[2] To complete the initial team Jones and Stokes decided on T. J. Woofter, Jr., a former Phelps-Stokes Fellow at the University of Georgia and son of the Dean of the School of Education there.[3] Walter B. Hill, another Phelps-Stokes Fellow at the University of Georgia, was subsequently employed as the fourth investigator.[1]

---

[1] Minutes of the Executive Committee and the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, November 25, 1912.

[2] Letter, Jones to Stokes, February 9, 1913, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-35.

[3] Woofter, who spent most of his life working with the problems of Negro education and interracial cooperation in the South, first as the Research Secretary of the Commission on Interracial Cooperation and later as a staff member of the University of North Carolina's Institute for Research in Social Sciences, is perhaps best known for his study of St. Helena Island, South Carolina, which was issued as Black Yeomanry (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1930).

The purpose of the study, as stated by Stokes in the Introduction to the first volume, was "to supply through an impartial investigation a body of facts which could be available to all interested, showing the status of Negro education, by an examination of the various colleges and public and private schools for colored youth in the United States."[2] The methods and scope of the study, as suggested by Jones,[3] were excepted in toto. His overriding methodological emphasis was on personal inspection. Of the efficacy of this approach he had little doubt. "It would be difficult to estimate the amount of improvement effected in the work of a school through the inspection of its work by one or two persons equipped not only to study but to advise when occasion permits."[4] Although each of the 791 institutions described was not observed personally, "every institution of any importance was visited by one or more agents."[5]

From each of the institutions canvassed, the investigators sought the following information:[6]

---

[1] Hill later became Field Agent for the General Education Board.

[2] Jones, Negro Education, I, xii.

[3] Letter, Jones to Stokes, November 14, 1912, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-35.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Jones, Negro Education, I, 4.

[6] Ibid.

1. Type of school; grades taught, emphasis on literary, industrial, or rural education.
2. Ownership and control.
3. Attendance.
4. Number, color, sex, training of teachers and workers.
5. School organization; curriculum; entrance requirements.
6. Value of property and endowment; accounting system.

This detailed information forms the bulk of the second volume of the study and need not be elucidated here. Suffice it to say that the factual material was seemingly objective, lucid, and hardily welcomed by most of those interested in Negro education at the time of publication. The methodological emphasis was a natural extension of Jones' earlier work in New York City and in the Hampton area, as well as his work with the Census Bureau, and was to be duplicated in his subsequent African surveys. Although the details concerning the individual schools need not concern us, what should be considered, at least cursorily, are Jones' conclusions and recommendations.

While crediting some institutions with the provision of excellent instruction, Jones concluded that "inadequacy and poverty are the outstanding characteristics of every type and grade of education for Negroes in the United States. No form of education is satisfactorily equipped or supported."[1] Although he understood the reasons for the attitude, he nonetheless deplored the fact that many Negro leaders were more eager for the literary and collegiate type of education than for the teacher-training, agricultural, or industrial institutions.[2]

---

[1] Jones, Negro Education, I, 9.

[2] Ibid.

95

This tendency he attributed to a misunderstanding of the real aims of industrial education. Though the primary aim of industrial education was the development of sound habits of hand and head, the economic advantages, which he felt were often overlooked because of the stigma attached to this type of education, should not be neglected. The way to combat the indifference to industrial education, he argued, was to make the race realize its low economic status, an understanding of which would greatly increase the Negro's interest in vocational education. Undoubtedly, most Negroes in the South were very cognizant of their low economic status and the fact that few were enamoured of the concept of industrial or agricultural education makes one wonder about the validity of Jones' assessment. It is probable that what Jones perceived for the Negro and what the Negro perceived for himself were hardly analogous. This divergence of opinions and perceptions became even more marked when the locale was shifted from the Southern United States to Africa.

Jones' recommendations were based on his theory of educational adaptation, and they placed special emphasis on the implementation and adaptation of industrial and rural (agricultural) education. He asserted that "all education shall stress, first, the development of character, including the simple but fundamental virtues of cleanliness, order, perseverance, and the qualities essential to the home, and second, adaptation to the needs of the pupil and the community."[1]

---

[1] Jones, Negro Education, I, 18.

There followed recommendations regarding teacher-training courses, sanitation, the theory and practice of gardening, neighborhood activities, and simple manual training. Of the latter he wrote that "the economic value [of manual training] to the colored people is emphasized by the comparative poverty of the race, while the educational result is even more necessary for the Negro than for the white, since the Negro's highly emotional nature requires for balance as much as possible of the concrete and definite."[1] Jones prided himself on evaluations derived from empirical data; however, he provides none for this blatantly spurious and unscientific assertion concerning "the Negro's highly emotional nature." Subjectivity seems to have replaced objectivity in this instance.

Leaving his objectivity aside for the moment, the most dominant theme throughout the report is the importance of industrial and agricultural education in Negro schools. Besides character training and economic independence, the school's "fundamental purpose is much broader than vocational efficiency or the resulting comfort or culture. The underlying principle of these schools is the adaptation of educational activities . . . to the needs of the pupil and community."[2] The industrial and manual development of the colored people of the South required the following courses of instruction adapted to the local conditions:[3]

---

[1] Jones, Negro Education, I, 23.

[2] Ibid., p. 81.

[3] Ibid., p. 90.

1. Simple manual training adapted to boys and girls in elementary schools;
2. Mechanical practice or household arts, vocational outlook, and elementary economics in secondary schools.
3. Rural or small town trades offered in small industrial schools.
4. Trade schools preparing industrial teachers and tradesmen for the mechanical and household arts for women.

Jones felt that "the rural education of the Negro is absolutely essential, not only to the welfare of the race, but also to the successful development of the Southern States."[1] With such a large proportion of the race in rural districts, and likely to remain there, Jones felt it imperative that the schools devote the bulk of their energies to dealing with the day to day realities of living and improving the dreadfully low standards of living. The improvement of rural conditions was such a necessity that Jones called on every school to make it possible for pupils to appreciate the economic and social significance of gardening and soil cultivation, to know the relation of soil to soul, to know that farming was not mere drudgery, but the source of culture as well as prosperity.[2] Exactly how the soil is related to the soul and culture he failed to specify.

---

[1] Jones felt that the Southern Negro, trained in industrial and agricultural education, would be a great economic tool for the South. In this he reflected the thinking of the conferees at the Capon Springs Conferences at the turn of the century. See Thomas Jesse Jones, "The Relation of Industrial Education to the Economic Progress of the South," The Southern Workman, XXXVIII (March, 1909), 139-144; and Harlan, Separate and Unequal, pp. 75-101.

[2] Jones, Negro Education, I, 109. Liberty H. Bailey of Cornell had long espoused the same theory. See p. 82 above. In 1967 Julius Nyerere of Tanzania would note the importance of agricultural education for an underdeveloped nation. See p. 295 below.

Undoubtedly, Jones' survey had an impact on Negro education. His critics vilified him in the most abusive language[1] just as his proponents extolled his great service. Illustrative of the latter is the following comment:

> It was the first time that cold, unemotional, scientific procedure had been applied to a field where a just sympathy and a much-needed and greatly-appreciated missionary zeal often obscured faults and weaknesses. . . . Since the publication was issued toward the end of the protracted conflict between higher education and manual training . . . , it was but natural that the advocates of higher education should see Dr. Jones as an ally of those forces which they thought were advocating one kind of education for the Negro and another for the white man. . . . Dr. Jones' recommendations for Negro education were not based on the policy of segregation in curriculum content or objectives. . . .[2]

It has been estimated that although approximately 80 percent of Jones' seventy-one recommendations were ultimately carried out, only 36 percent of the recommendations were implemented within three years of the completion of the report. And since it is doubtful whether many of the recommendations instituted more than three years after the completion of a survey can be attributed to its influence, we can see that only one in three of Jones' recommendations received favorable action. Of the seventy-one recommendations, forty-eight dealt with either curricular or administrative modifications, recommendations which are generally acted upon favorably least frequently. Those recommendations more positively received were concerned with changes in finance and accounting procedures and improvements to the physical plant.[1]

---

[1] See pp. 117-120 below.

[2] D. O. W. Holmes, "Twenty-five Years of Thomas Jesse Jones and the Phelps-Stokes Fund," Journal of Negro Education, VII (October, 1938), 476-478.

Despite the fact that only a few of his recommendations were implemented, the survey had the effect of catapulting Jones into the company of that rather select group of experts concerned with Negro education. For thirty years after the publication of the survey, Jones and the Phelps-Stokes Fund were to play a role in Negro education considerably out of proportion to the relatively small allocations which they pumped back into the system directly. If the influence of Jones and Stokes was disproportionate to the Phelps-Stokes Fund's financial largess, it was due in large measure to the contacts which they maintained with their peers in the field of Negro education.

## Two Influential Friends

James H. Dillard and Jackson Davis were two of these. Virginians by birth, the two men spent much of their respective careers working for the cause of Negro education in the South. If Dillard was the motive force behind the Anna T. Jeanes Fund, it was Jackson Davis who was responsible for hiring the first, and most noted, Jeanes teacher.

Graduating from William and Mary College in 1902, Davis taught several years in the segregated school system of his native state. Despite this cloistered existence, he soon became aware of the monumental problems of poverty and ignorance of the local people, and of the Negro in particular. Davis came into contact with Hollis B. Frissell of Hampton Institute and Dr. S. C. Mitchell, one of the original trustees of the Jeanes Fund, and he mentioned to them his idea of employing a competent teacher to visit the schools of a county to help the local teachers in their work. The year was 1908; Jackson Davis was then Superintendent of Schools of Henrico County, Virginia, and he followed the advice of Frissell and Mitchell and presented his case to James H. Dillard.[1] In this initial exchange Davis informed Dillard that he wanted to make industrial training an essential part of the work in the Negro schools in Henrico County, and on October 26, 1908, he wrote that he had secured Miss Virginia E. Randolph (colored) as the industrial teacher at a salary of forty dollars per month. On behalf of the Jeanes Fund, Dillard agreed to pay Miss Randolph's salary.

---

[1] Walter Crosby Eells, "Results of Survey of Negro Colleges," Journal of Negro Education, IV (October, 1935), 478-479.

From 1910 to 1915 Davis acted as the State Supervisor of Negro Rural Schools in Virginia, after which time he served as the General Field Agent in the South for the General Education Board. In 1929 he became an Associate Director of the Board, a position which he held until his death in 1947. His tenure with the General Education Board afforded him an opportunity to continue his work in the field of Negro

---

[1] This discussion of the Jeanes teachers and the roles of Davis and Dillard is taken from Lance G. E. Jones, The Jeanes Teacher in the United States, 1908-1933, pp. 1-117; and Wright and Redcay, The Negro Rural School Fund, Inc.

101

education.

The close relationship between the Jeanes Fund and the General Education Board is illustrated as much by the considerable financial support the former received from the latter as by the fact that most of the Jeanes Fund's meetings were convened in the offices of the Board.

In his position with the General Education Board and later as a trustee of the Jeanes Fund, Jackson Davis worked in tandem with Jones and the Phelps-Stokes Fund on the problems of Negro education in the South. Indeed, on more than one occasion the minutes of Jeanes Fund meetings record that Jones was present by special invitation.

By virtue of his position with the General Education Board, Davis acted on requests for financial assistance from many Southern educational institutions. And it was not unusual for Jones to forward to the man he dubbed "the guardian angel of Negro education"[1] specific requests for aid which the Phelps-Stokes Fund was disinclined to honor.[2] In addition to his financial duties, Davis often helped the Phelps-Stokes Fund shepherd foreign guests whom it sponsored to the show places of Negro education in the South. When Sir Gordon Guggisberg came to the United States in 1927 under the auspices of the

---

[1] Letter, Jones to Davis, March 4, 1938, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-3.

[2] Examples include the National Training School for Women and Girls of Washington, D.C., and the Bethune-Coleman School in North Carolina, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-7.

Fund, it was Jackson Davis who accompanied the ex-Governor of the Gold Coast on his trip to the Penn School, Tuskegee, and the Calhoun School.[1] This cooperative spirit and kindred outlook were rewarded when, in 1939, Jackson Davis was elected a trustee of the Phelps-Stokes Fund and, following the retirement of Anson Phelps Stokes in 1946, its president.

The work of James H. Dillard was highly regarded by Stokes, a fact which largely accounted for the Phelps-Stokes Fund's first education allocation--$2500 for the Jeanes Fund.[2] His stewardship of the Jeanes and Slater Funds, coupled with his proven academic and administrative acumen, made his appearance on the Negro education scene at the turn of the century somewhat less than fortuitous. A sixteen-year association with Tulane University and his membership on the Louisiana State Board of Education and the Southern Education Board had put Dillard in touch with most Southern educational leaders and had made him acutely aware of the educational needs of the time, as well as of the current educational ideologies. Dillard was an organizer of the University Commission on the Race Question in the South, to which the Phelps-Stokes Fund pledged $1000 at one of its early meetings.[3] At this same meeting the trustees authorized $500 per annum for four years for a course of five or more lectures by representative Southerners on the Negro and his problem; the lecturers to be chosen by the president ofthe University of Virginia, the chancellor of the University of Georgia, and James H. Dillard.

---

[1] Letter, Davis to Jones, October 20, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-3.

[2] Minutes of the Executive Meeting and Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, November 15, 1912.

[3] Ibid.

Dillard was president of the Jeanes Fund from 1907 to 1931, a period during which he oversaw the expenditure of some one and one-half million dollars for salaries of Jeanes supervisory teachers. But even after administering this large allocation and those from the General Education and other organizations, Dillard was far from satisfied with what he found in the average schools. What he wanted for the children was education, and he was by no means certain they were getting it. After having visited some thirty Negro schools and colleges over a three week span he lamented that all the institutions had great advantages in everything "except the very important item of education. . . ."[1]

Despite, or perhaps because of, the obvious shortcomings of the Southern educational systems, particularly for the Negro, Dillard threw himself wholeheartedly into his attempt to help upgrade Southern Negro education. To this end he joined Anson Phelps Stokes and Hollis B. Frissell as a trustee of the General Education Board in 1917, and was elected a trustee of the Phelps-Stokes Fund in 1923, moving up to the vice-presidency the next year. Dillard well understood the problems and immediate possibilities of Negro education. His colleague on the General Education Board, Abraham Flexner, said of him that ". . . Dr. Dillard never does the radical things which he proclaims. While in views and attitudes he is sincerely sympathetic with all progressive movements that are sound, he is rarely ever misled by an idealism that cannot be realized."[1]

---

[1] Letter, Dillard to Jones, March 2, 1929, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-9(1).

Perhaps it was this realistic approach (or what he construed as such) that drew Dillard's attention to the little things on the educational spectrum--the rural school and its problems, the Jeanes teacher, the constant emphasis on the rudiments of education as they related to everyday life. Like Booker Washington, whom he knew well and admired, Dillard wanted the Negro to inch forward, utilizing those resources at hand, gradually moving towards that Utopia which had been expected since 1863. And for Dillard one of the most efficacious means to this end was the Jeanes teacher, who could make contact in the rural communities as no one else could and who could adapt the school curriculum to the conditions of the community. Hygiene, home economics, and some industrial and agricultural training were to form the backbone of the curriculum of the rural schools.

## Influence at Southern Negro Schools

To those who accepted the idea of vocational education for the

---

[1] Letter, Flexner to Jones, March 28, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-9(1).

Negro masses Hampton and Tuskegee were the Medina and Mecca from which they drew succor. Thomas Jesse Jones and Anson Phelps Stokes were among these. Consequently, the official ties between the Phelps-Stokes Fund and these two citadels of vocational education were very strong. As early as 1912 the Fund's trustees allocated $1200 to meet the expenses of the Tuskegee Negro Farmers Conference; in 1914 $2000 was voted to help Hampton establish a fund for religious education and $500 to Booker Washington to inaugurate a Negro health day movement throughout the South; and in 1916 some $2800 was earmarked for the new Principal of Tuskegee, Robert R. Moton, to be used for religious work and for a campaign to combat illiteracy.[1] Moton became a trustee of the Phelps-Stokes Fund in 1922, Stokes a trustee of Tuskegee in 1924, and Jones a trustee of Hampton in 1932, thereby completing the official circle.

When Hampton and Tuskegee undertook a joint campaign to raise $5,000,000 in 1924, the executive committee lured into its ranks Anson Phelps Stokes who, besides lending his prestige as president of the Phelps-Stokes Fund and a canon of Washington Cathedral, had gained some expertise as a fund-raiser in his years at Yale. The Fund's largest single contribution to the cause of Negro education was the $25,000 the trustees voted to the Hampton-Tuskegee Endowment Fund on

---

[1] Minutes of the Executive Committee and Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, November 20, 1912, November 18, 1914, November 15, 1916.

November 19, 1924.[1]

Although these official ties between the Phelps-Stokes Fund and Hampton and Tuskegee were important, it was the unofficial contacts between Jones, Stokes, Moton, and Gregg and Rogers of Hampton which were of even greater significance. Indicative of the strength of these ties is the fact that when the trustees of Fisk and Howard Universities were considering the selection of new presidents, Jones, a member of both Boards, solicited the opinion of Moton regarding the possible choices. And despite Jones' assertion in 1916 that "it is the emphatic conclusion of this study . . . that sound policy requires white management and white teachers to have some part in the education of the [Negro] race,"[2] he now proposed Negro presidents for both institutions, W. T. B. Williams for Fisk and Jesse Moorland for Howard, only to have Moton demur. Jones' rationale for his choices had been solely on the basis of expediency--". . . I am convinced that the only way to avoid trouble and to provide fairly normal and peaceful developments of these institutions is to elect strong colored presidents"[3]--

---

[1] Minutes of the Executive Committee and the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, November 19, 1924. The largest contributors to the campaign were the General Education Board and John D. Rockefeller, Jr., each pledging $1,000,000, and George Eastman who, when he offered his $2,000,000 warned that "the only hope of the Negro race . . . is through proper education of the Hampton-Tuskegee type, which is directed almost wholly toward making them useful citizens through education on industrial lines." Quoted from a brochure printed by the Hampton-Tuskegee Endowment Fund, n.d., Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-1(1).

[2] Jones, Negro Education, I, 7.

[3] Letter, Jones to Moton, May 7, 1925, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-2.

and Moton's opposition was on the same basis, but for different reasons. While endorsing the initial choice and hesitating over the second, he felt that there was a larger question involved, i.e.,

> the wisdom of colored men heading these two institutions. There is nothing, of course, against their heading the two institutions per se, but whether it is the best thing for the Negro race and the white race to perspicuously [sic] cut loose the contact which has been so helpful in the past sixty years with the high type of white people such as have controlled these institutions and others . . . [is questionable].[1]

Whether Moton's fear of cutting the umbilical cord carried any weight in the subsequent selections cannot be determined; however, it is noteworthy that a compromise was reached whereby a black president was selected for Howard and a white president for Fisk.[2] Perhaps the influence of Stokes can be detected here, for, despite the fact that he was a trustee of neither institution, he thought ". . . the experiment of placing one colored university . . . under colored leadership well worth considering. . . ."[3]

The contacts were personal as well as professional. All arrangements for Moton's 1926-27 around the world tour were made by the office secretary of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, and when he embarked from San Francisco for Honolulu on November 26, 1926, the Tuskegeean's pockets literally bulged with letters of introduction from his friends Stokes and Jones.[1] But the influence of Jones, Stokes, and the Fund reached beyond Hampton and Tuskegee and personal favors; it ranged along the whole spectrum of Negro education in the South, and several of the institutions which this influence affected most markedly should be mentioned in passing.

---

[1] Letter, Moton to Jones, May 14, 1925, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-2.

[2] Mordecai Johnson at Howard and Thomas Elsa Jones at Fisk.

[3] Letter, Stokes to Jones, April 25, 1925, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-2.

The Calhoun Colored School, incorporated in 1892 in Lowndes County, Alabama, was founded by Charlotte Thorn, who had taught Robert R. Moton at Hampton. It enrolled, in the late 1920's, some 275 pupils, ranging in age from five to twenty-six. The school had two tasks: (1) to send pupils on to Hampton, Tuskegee, Morehouse and Spelman; and (2) to send directly back into home and community life those who were to be its leaven.[2] By 1929, however, the leaven had failed to rise to the occasion and the school was in dire financial straits. To Jones Calhoun seemed now ". . . to be close to a parting of the ways . . . and I have accepted membership on the Trustee Board in order that I may participate more effectively in the necessary reorganization."[3] There he joined the Principals of Hampton and Tuskegee. Jones felt an obligation to do his part to save the school because he felt that "the educational work of Calhoun is absolutely necessary to the welfare of the Negro people. . . . Miss Thorn has been able to combine the community features of school work with the usual training in the three R's."[1]

---

[1] Letter, Moton to Stokes, November 30, 1926, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-2.

[2] Report of the Principal of the Calhoun Colored School to the Board of Trustees, 1929, p. 6, copy in Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-6(1).

[3] Letter, Jones to Jackson Davis, October 7, 1929, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-6(1a).

But even before he wrote that letter and accepted his position as a trustee of Calhoun, Jones discerned tendencies at Calhoun and kindred institutions which struck at the heart of his educational philosophy:

> The forces controlling Negro education, notably Negro public opinion and state standardisation, are forcing the literary objectives to the neglect of the social realities required by the Negro. . . . I am genuinely perplexed as to the ability of a school like Calhoun to withstand this seemingly overwhelming movement. Even Alabama state aid seems dependent upon the development of high school standards at Calhoun. . . . In view of the almost universal determination to copy the white man's methods, I am more and more inclined to center my efforts on the change of white methods and objectives in the confidence that the Negroes will accept them once they are realised by white people. . . .[2]

Despite his apparent perplexity and disappointment with the trends he discerned in Negro education in general and at Calhoun in particular, Jones' efforts were instrumental in helping Calhoun to survive. Once again he turned to his friend Jackson Davis and in 1932 the General Education Board responded with a grant of $20,000; in the same year Davis and Jones importuned the Carnegie Corporation, which responded with an initial $5000, followed by $7500 in 1935.[1] However, while this infusion of capital did alleviate the immediate problems, it only served to illustrate the desperate plight of the private Negro schools in the South during the years of the depression, years when Northern philanthropy could not help and most State Education Departments would not help.

---

[1] Letter, Jones to Moton, May 1, 1929, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-6(1b).

[2] Letter, Jones to Margaret McCulloch, January 3, 1929, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-6(1b).

But Jones was insistent, for Calhoun was "not just another Negro School. The Calhoun Land Company is the only successful demonstration of community land purchasing by Negroes in the United States. . . ."[2] It was this integration of the school with the life of the community which elevated Calhoun to its pedestal in Jones' eyes. But struggle though he did for Calhoun, enlisting Dillard, Davis, Moton, Stokes, and the State Agent for Negro education in the cause, the school's destiny was sealed long before it was said that "the Calhoun School, long a hobby of Thomas Jesse Jones and Jack Davis, has at last closed and the property will probably be given to the State of Alabama."[3]

---

[1] Calhoun School file, the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

[2] Letter, Jones to F. P. Keppel, October 31, 1936, Calhoun School file, the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The Calhoun Land Trust, established with land acquired by the school in 1919, encouraged local people to buy land at attractive prices. "It is the purpose to encourage farmers with families, who have the ability and equipment, to buy farms and obtain the advantages of the new roads for a wider market for perishable products as well as the facilities of the school. A 20 acre farm with house may be purchased at present for as low as $450. . . ." From a copy of the Calhoun Land Trust, dated April 6, 1932, in Phelps-Stokes Fund file c-6(2).

[3] Record of an interview between Robert Lester, Jones and Davis, May 6, 1944, in Calhoun School file, the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

The problems facing the independent vocationally-oriented schools for Negroes in the South during the 1920's and 1930's were put succinctly by Davis when he said that

> there is a sort of a "jinx" about all these industrial schools. They pattern after Hampton and Tuskegee in the matter of size and scope, as well as in their ideals of education. This leads to unfortunate mistakes . . . and to extravagence in that their whole efforts are so scattered and spread out that too much of the money is spent for the expense of collecting and administering and too little for teaching. . . . The job is to reorganize the school on a basis modest enough for the county in time to support it with state aid. . . .[1]

Another school which suffered from similar problems but to which Jones and the Phelps-Stokes Fund were irresistibly drawn was the Penn Normal, Industrial and Agricultural School on St. Helena Island, South Carolina.

The Penn School was an outgrowth of the missionary interest in the Negro and his education in the South during the Civil War days. Founded in 1862 by Miss Laura M. Towne, the administration of the school was taken over in 1905 by Miss Rossa B. Cooley and Miss Grace B. House, both former teachers at Hampton Institute.[2] With Frissell as chairman of the trustees, Penn soon became ". . . an agricultural school with activities extending throughout the whole community and ideals of education as broad as life itself. . . ."[3]

---

[1] Letter, Davis to Jones, May 16, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-22.

[2] Woofter, Black Yeomanry, pp. 186-204. See also the forthcoming doctoral dissertation on the Penn School by A. Augustus of Teachers College, Columbia University.

[3] Woofter, Black Yeomanry, p. 194.

All students studied agriculture and each was instructed in the use of tools and the fundamental processes in one of the shops. Industries taught included carpentry, wheelwrighting, cobbling, blacksmithing, harness making, and basketry for boys; cooking and sewing for the girls. Like its sister institution in Alabama, the Penn School attempted to integrate the life of the community with that of the school. And to a remarkable extent it succeeded. Stokes spoke of the "most important contribution to the cause of rural education" the school made under the direction of Misses Cooley and House. And he noted that ". . . a score or more of visitors from Africa . . . have been greatly impressed with the soundness of its [Penn's] educational policy and the remarkable results which have been achieved through a constructive program related to the actual needs of the people and all conducted in an atmosphere of Christian goodwill and inspiration."[1]

Although neither Jones nor Stokes had an official connection with the school, their enthusiasm for its work was unmitigated. Indeed, over a thirty-five year period the Phelps-Stokes Fund allocated more money to the Penn School than any other secondary institution with the exception of Calhoun.[1]

---

[1] Letter, Stokes to Francis R. Cope, Jr., December 30, 1943, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-5.

Jones' periodic calls on Davis and on the Carnegie Corporation for donations toward the work at Calhoun were usually coupled with appeals for the Penn School. The Carnegie Corporation matched its $5000 appropriation to Calhoun with a like amount to Penn in 1932; the $7500 Jones secured from the Corporation for Calhoun in 1935 was duplicated for Penn. But despite these efforts and the singular work undertaken at the Penn School, a financial crisis became evident as early as 1927. The continuance of the work at Penn was, in Jones' estimation, of dual importance. For the Negro South it was evidence of what a certain kind of education could do for the individual and the community. In addition, he was convinced "that the continuation of the present community education realized at Penn is essential to any cooperation of America with Colonial education in Africa."[2] It must have been painful for Jones to witness the demise of these two schools--Calhoun and Penn--which actively practiced his concept of consciousness of the community. Although there was some muted hope during the 1930's that the Penn School might become financially solvent and independent, it was destined to follow the Calhoun Colored School onto the educational junkpile in the 1940's.

---

[1] Anson Phelps Stokes, Progress in Negro Status and Race Relations in the United States, 1911-1946: The Thirty-five Year Report of the Phelps-Stokes Fund (New York: n.p., 1948), pp. 168-169; and Twenty-five Year Report of the Phelps-Stokes Fund (New York: Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1932), pp. 106-108. During this period the Fund appropriated $15,340 to the Penn School; $28,010.70 to the Calhoun School; and $9565 to the Snow Hill Institute. Other institutional recipients of note included Fisk University with $26,910; Hampton Institute with $13,215; and Tuskegee Institute with $32,280. To the totals of these latter two should be added the $25,000 allocation to the Hampton-Tuskegee Endowment Fund in the mid-1920's.

[2] Letter, Jones to Hollingsworth Wood, January 13, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file G-5.

## Interracial Work

The Phelps-Stokes Fund's interest in the South was not, however, limited to education per se. An equally important facet of the Fund's domestic work was its emphasis on various forms of interracial cooperation. This interest was manifest in Anson Phelps Stokes' first recommendations to the trustees, which included a grant of $12,500 each to the Universities of Georgia and Virginia for the establishment of fellowships for the study of the Negro.[1] Despite some initial problems involving the selection of Fellows and library facilities, the program soon became stabilized at both institutions. The first two fellows at the University of Georgia were T. J. Woofter, Jr. and Walter B. Hill, both of whom later worked with Jones on the survey of Negro education.[2] On January 5, 1920, a conference, organized by Jones, of the Phelps-Stokes Fund Fellows was held at Tuskegee where the young scholars not only exchanged ideas about their research but also talked with Jack Davis, Robert Moton, and Sydney B. Frissell, the son of Hampton's late Principal. Of the impact of the program Will W. Alexander, long-time director of the Atlanta-based Commission on Interracial Cooperation, said: "I do not believe that any work which has been done has borne larger fruit than the Phelps-Stokes Fellowships, and I . . . [wonder if they should not be] extended to a larger number of schools. . . ."[1]

---

[1] See pp. 63-64 below.

[2] Between 1913 and 1938, fourteen Phelps-Stokes Fellowship Studies were issued as Bulletins of the University of Georgia, while twelve Phelps-Stokes Fellowship Studies were issued as Publications of the University of Virginia. Woofter's study was entitled The Negroes of Athens, Georgia, and Hill's Rural Survey of Clarke County, Georgia, with Special Reference to the Negroes.

The Commission on Interracial Cooperation, founded in April, 1919, undertook the experiment of promoting definite cooperation between the white and colored leaders in Southern communities. At a time when the country was seething with racial distrust and hostility, a group of interested parties, including J. H. Dillard and Jackson Davis, Wallace Buttrick of the General Education Board, and with Thomas Jesse Jones as secretary, met in Atlanta to seek some means to alleviate the mounting racial tensions. Simultaneously, a group of Negro leaders, including Mrs. Booker T. Washington, Robert R. Moton and John Hope of Atlanta University were engaged in the same quest at Tuskegee. Throwing prudence to the winds (this was not an auspicious moment for interracial gatherings in the South) the two groups soon met in Atlanta and formed themselves into the Commission on Interracial Cooperation. Across the South hundreds of interracial commissions were established to further interracial understanding. This initial step towards racial conciliation soon led to more ambitious projects, including community health programs, anti-lynching efforts, and educational programs.[1]

---

[1] Letter, Alexander to Jones, December 3, 1926, Phelps-Stokes Fund file A-21.

Not surprisingly, the trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund approved of this cooperative effort and made an initial grant of $2,500 to the Commission two years after its founding.[2] When, in 1927, the Commission began to have financial problems, it was to Jones and Dillard that Alexander turned for help. "Dr. Dillard has agreed to see him [Keppel of the Carnegie Corporation] this week and maybe it would help for me to see him, but if he is not influenced by the appeals of you and Dr. Dillard . . . there would be very little gained by my seeing him."[3] Prompted by a $400,000 contingency grant from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, the Commission created in 1929 a fund raising committee, dubbed the Stabilization Fund, to help raise the capital on which the Rockefeller grant was contingent. Robert R. Moton was chairman of this committee, which counted Dillard, Jones and Stokes among its members.

---

[1] The Stabilization Fund of the Commission on Interracial Cooperation, A Sane Approach to the Race Problem (New York: Commission on Interracial Cooperation, 1930), pp. 6-18.

[2] Minutes of the Executive Committee and the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, November 16, 1921. By 1945 the Fund had voted some $45,000 for the work of the Commission and its successor, the Southern Regional Council, Inc., Anson Phelps Stokes, Negro Status, p. 172.

[3] Alexander to Jones, February 24, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-14(1).

The list of organizations engaged in interracial cooperation to which the Phelps-Stokes Fund gave material and moral support between 1911 and 1945 is lengthy and warrants no more than a mention at this juncture. Prominent on this list were the Southern University Race Commission; the Southern Publicity Committee; the National Urban League; the Colored Men's Department of the Y.M.C.A.; the Student Volunteer Movement of New York; the Federal Council of Churches; and the Negro branch of the Boy Scouts of America.[1] But the Fund, despite its apparent good intentions, was not without its critics, who feared it wanted to gain hegemony over the whole structure of Negro education as well as stifle the legitimate political and social protest of the Negro, North and South.

## Two Negro Critics

By his assertion that "it is the conclusion of this study . . . that sound policy requires white management and white teachers to have some part in the education of the [Negro] race,"[2] Jones opened the door for a spate of virulent criticism regarding his motives and those of the organization he represented. The most rancorous came from Carter G. Woodson, the Negro director of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History and the founder and longtime editor of the Journal of Negro History. Recognizing that Jones' 1917 Negro education survey had catapulted him "into fame as the greatest living authority on the Negro . . . ," Woodson charged that thereafter

---

[1] Anson Phelps Stokes, Progress in Negro Status, pp. 170-172; and Twenty Year Report of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1911-1931, p. 109.

[2] Jones, Negro Education, I, 7.

> . . . all channels of philanthropy for Negroes [were closed] except through Jones and Anson Phelps Stokes. No school was considered ideal by these "controllers" unless it followed the usual industrial lines and emphasized domestic arts, domestic science, gardening, and home nursing. Schools which concentrated on developing the power of the Negro to think and do for himself were not desirable and were classified as unworthy of philanthropic support. . . .[1]

Woodson was critical of the survey results not only because of their vocational emphases, but also because Jones "reported as questionable and unworthy of support many of the struggling Negro schools, which although below standard, had educated and inspired thousands of Negroes who would not have received any education at all if these schools had not been established and maintained on a lower level." He considered Jones and the Fund to be nefarious for distributing "among Negro enterprises here and there small donations of from $100

---

[1] Carter G. Woodson, review of Progress in Negro Status and Race Relations, 1911-1946; the Thirty-five Year Report of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, in Journal of Negro History, XXXIV (1949), 368. Apropos Woodson's criticisms, it is instructive to note that of the three institutions--Fisk, Howard, Meharry Medical School--adjudged of 'all college level' in the survey, Jones' curricular recommendations for the two liberal arts institutions were almost exclusively along vocational lines. For Fisk he recommended "that increased provision be made for teacher training, manual training, and the theory and practice of gardening." For Howard, he recommended, among other things, "that in the entrance requirements to college courses recognition be given to such important subjects as social studies, teacher training, scientific agriculture, manual arts, and household economics, and that provision be made for presenting the theory and practice of gardening in the preparation of teachers." See Jones, Negro Education, I, 154 and 538.

119

to $200, and thus silencing those who might have otherwise objected to his policies."[1]

Nor did Woodson speak alone: alongside, somewhat more eloquently, was the powerful voice of W. E. B. DuBois, who felt that for a time Jones had "sympathized with the aspirations of Negroes for leadership and self-determination rather than with the idea of a close-corporation of guiding philanthropists . . . but then gradually there came a change as Mr. Jones left Hampton in 1909. . . ." Whatever the reasons for this shift, "the point is that he . . . definitely and persistently began to work to displace Negro leaders, and gather into his own hands such . . . information and power as would gradually give him the position of arbiter and patron of the Negro race in America."[2] DuBois was offended by Jones' allegation that, almost without exception, Negro education directed by Negroes was a failure and that Negro education to succeed must be directed by white people. Implicit in DuBois' early criticisms of Jones was the fear that, in exchange for the chance to work at the Negro problem granted by the controlling white clique, the Phelps-Stokes Fund's Educational Director had to assent to the proposition that 'non-acceptable' or 'unsafe' Negroes must be kept from the leadership of their race. Jones' assertion that Negro education must be directed by whites only reinforced this fear.

---

[1] Carter G. Woodson, "Thomas Jesse Jones," Journal of Negro History, XXXV (1950), 107.

[2] W. E. B. DuBois, "Thomas Jesse Jones," The Crisis, XXII (October, 1921), 253.

Despite this fear and several other examples of Jones' alleged chicanery vis-a-vis the Negro both at home and abroad, DuBois felt there was a larger issue involved than Jones or the Phelps-Stokes Fund, one that transcended personalities and was basic to all phases of Negro life. "Are we going to consent," he asked, "to have our interests represented in the most important councils of the world--missionary boards, educational committees, in all activities for social uplift--by white men who speak for us, on the theory that we cannot speak for ourselves? And must the selection of the white man who is to represent us be taken entirely out of our hands?"[1] His answer, of course, was an emphatic no.

While these criticisms were voiced by a small minority in the United States at the close of the second decade of the twentieth century, they were to be heard with more frequency and from a wider spectrum of opinion once the Phelps-Stokes Fund transferred its activities to Africa in the 1920's, the continent to which we now turn our attention.

---

[1] DuBois, "Thomas Jesse Jones," p. 256.

# CHAPTER IV

# FIRST VENTURES IN AFRICAN EDUCATION

## The First Education Commission

The Phelps-Stokes Fund's involvement in Africa was guaranteed by the proviso in Caroline Phelps Stokes' will for "the education of Negroes both in Africa and the United States." That the Fund had such an impact on the evolution of African educational policy throughout such large regions of the continent was due largely to extraneous factors, especially the need of the British Colonial Office for a common educational creed in Africa, and the timeliness of its two Education Commissions.

The seeds for the Phelps-Stokes Education Commissions to Africa were sown at the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in 1910, the year before the Fund was incorporated. Delegates at Edinburgh manifested a discontent with existing mission policy, especially in Africa, and pointed to the impossibility of the missions staffing and financing the burgeoning African educational systems.[1] J. H. Oldham was the Organizing Secretary of this Conference, Secretary of its Continuation Committee and of the International Missionary Council, which was an outgrowth of this Committee. In 1912 he visited the

---

[1] David G. Scanlon, ed., Church, State, and Education in Africa (New York: Teachers College Press, 1966), p. 15; and World Missionary Conference, 1910, Report of the Commission (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., n.d.).

American South and concluded that the experience of American Negro education was relevant for Africa.[1] This was the year before Jones began his survey of Negro education under the auspices of the Phelps-Stokes Fund. The third of what was to become the triumvirate of the African education directorate, Charles T. Loram of South Africa, was also in the United States during this period, completing his doctoral work at Teachers College, Columbia University. Their kindred outlook (resulting from their American experiences) towards the problems of African education, as well as their strategic positions, were to ensure that the three--who did not meet for several years--played a major role in the growth of official African education policy in the British colonies during the 1920's and 1930's.[2]

When in 1919 the American Baptist Foreign Missionary Society channelled a request through the Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Mission Conferences of North America for an African education survey, it was not surprising that this latter group should turn to the Phelps-Stokes Fund which, as a result of its recently published Negro Education survey, was considered the outstanding authority on problems of the education of underdeveloped peoples.[1] And since the Fund's Educational Director understood the problems of American Negro education so well, there was no reason to doubt that this knowledge could be transferred to Africa.

---

[1] J. H. Oldham, "A Missionary Survey of the Year 1912," The International Review of Missions, January, 1913, p. 49. It was also during 1912 that Tuskegee Institute hosted the International Conference on the Negro, at which a similar conclusion was voiced. For details of the Conference, see The Southern Workman, LXI (June, 1912), 347-352.

[2] The ideological parallels between Jones and Loram were brought out by Oldham in a review of Jones' Negro Education and Loram's The Education of the South African Native. See The International Review of Missions, April, 1918, pp. 242-247.

This request by the Baptist Foreign Missionary Society came some five years after the Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference began agitating for an official commission of enquiry into the educational facilities and needs of the West African colonies, a request which Harcourt, the Colonial Secretary, did not feel obliged to honor.[2] Although the initiative eventually came from the United States, the Phelps-Stokes F[illegible]sured of the active cooperation of the British M[illegible]ite the fact that their similar proposal ha[illegible] interested in the project.

Arrangements f[illegible]cussed at meetings during 1919 and 1920[illegible] the Phelps-Stokes Fund Trustees voted the[illegible]e Executive Committee's authority on problems of the education of underdeveloped peoples.[1] And since the Fund's Educational Director understood the problems of American Negro education so well, there was no reason to doubt that this knowledge could be transferred to Africa.

---

[1] Minutes of the Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Mission Conference of North America, February 28, 1919, Archives of the Division of the National Council of the Churches of Christ, Inter-Church Center, New York. See also minutes of meetings held on June 19, 1919, and December 4, 1919.

[2] Letter, F. G. A. Butler to A. H. L. Fraser, June 7, 1914, Edinburgh House Box: "West African, Education and General."

[3] The Trustees of the Fund discussed the proposal at meetings on April 16, 1919, and November 19, 1919, while the Executive Committee did the spade work in meetings on October 17, 1919, and January 30, 1920.

This request by the Baptist Foreign Missionary Society came some five years after the Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference began agitating for an official commission of enquiry into the educational facilities and needs of the West African colonies, a request which Harcourt, the Colonial Secretary, did not feel obliged to honor.[2] Although the initiative eventually came from the United States, the Phelps-Stokes Fund could be assured of the active cooperation of the British Mission Boards which, despite the fact that their similar proposal had been denied, were still very interested in the project.

Arrangements for the initial survey were discussed at meetings during 1919 and 1920,[3] and on November 19, 1919, the Phelps-Stokes Fund Trustees voted their formal approval of the Executive Committee's recommendations, viz.:

---

[1] Minutes of the Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Mission Conference of North America, February 28, 1919, Archives of the Division of the National Council of the Churches of Christ, Inter-Church Center, New York. See also minutes of meetings held on June 19, 1919, and December 4, 1919.

[2] Letter, F. G. A. Butler to A. H. L. Fraser, June 7, 1914, Edinburgh House Box: "West African, Education and General."

[3] The Trustees of the Fund discussed the proposal at meetings on April 16, 1919, and November 19, 1919, while the Executive Committee did the spade work in meetings on October 17, 1919, and January 30, 1920.

> that a survey of educational conditions and opportunities among the negroes of Africa with a special view of finding the type or types of education best adapted to meet the needs of the natives, be undertaken by the Phelps-Stokes Fund. . . .[1]

Oldham and Moton, both strong proponents of the survey, were invited to the Executive Committee meeting on January 30, 1920, when final details were worked out. The former was strongly of the opinion that Jones should spend four to six weeks in the United Kingdom, making contacts with English missionary boards and government officials who had returned from various African colonies, as well as studying government reports on the colonies to be visited. Financial arrangements were also discussed at this meeting.[2]

The Commission's personnal included: Jones as Chairman; L. A. Roy, the Office Secretary of the Fund, Secretary; Henry Stanley Hollenbeck, an American medical missionary in Angola; Mr. and Mrs. Arthur W. Wilkie, as representatives of the British missionary societies; and

---

[1] Meeting of the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, November 19, 1919.

[2] Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, January 30, 1920. The Fund allocated only $5000, insisting that travelling expenses should be met by the interested missionary societies, and that the expense of publication of the final report should be shared. Subscriptions from the societies were as follows: Baptist Church, North, $2000; Methodist Church, North, $2000; Disciples Missionary Board, $2000; Congregational Board, $1500; Presbyterian, North, $2000; Presbyterian, South, $1000; Episcopal Church, $1000; United Brethren, $500. Oldham said that while British societies would undoubtedly give all possible cooperation, they were now greatly embarrassed because of their inability to contribute to the survey.

J. E. K. Aggrey, a native of the Gold Coast who had spent the last twenty-two years in the United States. Charles T. Loram would act as the Commission's guide in South Africa.[1]

J. H. Oldham's role in this, the Phelps-Stokes Fund's first venture in African education, was crucial. His was to remain a pervasive influence in many of the Fund's subsequent African undertakings and, consequently, a very brief digression to examine his position is in order.

Oldham was born in 1874 and educated at Edinburgh Academy and Trinity College, Oxford. At the age of twenty-three he went to the Punjab with the Scottish National Council of the Young Men's Christian Association. Three years later he was invalided home, and in 1904 he became mission secretary of the Student Christian Movement. From 1908 to 1910 he was Secretary of the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh and, as already noted, Secretary of its Continuation Committee from 1910 to 1921. In addition to his position as Secretary of the International Missionary Council, he edited The International Review of Missions, which was to become the quasi-official journal of the Protestant missionary societies in Great Britain for fifteen years from its inception in 1912.

Edinburgh House in London became the headquarters for the International Missionary Council, and it was from there that Oldham, described by one observer as ". . . that arch intriguer for good,"[1] began to exert an influence over Members of Parliament, Primates of England and, most importantly for our purposes, the general direction of British colonial and missionary policy.[2] Early in the 1920's, just at the time when the Phelps-Stokes Education Commissions were undertaking their African surveys, Oldham began to devote more attention to the problems of African education. He introduced Jones to those officials most responsible for African educational policy in Britain. In 1924 he became the Fund's representative in the United Kingdom,[3] and during the same year he organized the first of several conferences which attempted to transform the African Education Commission's recommendations into official mission policy.

---

[1] Reverend John Tucker of the American Board in Angola was appointed a member, but had to resign at the last moment.

He used his influence to bring pressure on the Colonial Office to reconsider its policy of mission exclusion in Northern Nigeria in the mid-1920's.[4] Several years later he was the key figure on the Hilton Young Commission, which played a large role in assuring that Kenya Africans would not be subjected indefinitely to white hegemony.[1] His influence was, in short, great, and it is doubtful if the Phelps-Stokes Fund would have enjoyed such success in its African work during the 1920's and 1930's without Oldham's continual advocacy on its behalf.

---

[1] R. E. Wriath, Guggisberg (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 146.

[2] The archives of Edinburgh House contain numerous pieces of correspondence between Oldham and the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of York, Ramsey MacDonald, and Stanley Baldwin. A biography of Oldham which was being prepared by George Bennett of the Institute of Commonwealth Studies, Oxford, and Mrs. Kathleen Bliss has been suspended temporarily because of Mr. Bennett's premature death.

[3] Meeting of the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, November 19, 1924.

[4] See Edinburgh House Box 21.

As noted above, Jones' survey of Negro education--bearing the unmistakable imprint of the Hampton-Tuskegee philosophy--strongly advocated education in the industrial and agricultural vein for the Negro masses. Literary education, besides being dysfunctional in the Southern milieu, also carried political dangers with it, dangers which Jones and his peers were anxious to suppress. However, it is important to keep the influence of Jones and the Phelps-Stokes Fund in perspective; while indeed his report on Negro education and the two subsequent African educational surveys did play a crucial role in the evolution of Colonial Office policy towards African education in the 1920's and 1930's, as well as greatly influencing mission policy, there was a growing body of opinion in the United Kingdom which viewed education for the African in a remarkable analogous way.[2]

As early as 1903 J. P. Rodger, the Governor of the Gold Coast, had, after a tour of the Southern United States, made manual training compulsory in the schools under his jurisdiction.[1] But more than a half-century before Rodger's pronouncement, a report had been issued by the Education Committee of the Privy Council to the Colonial Office, detailing the importance of industrial training for the coloured races in the colonies.[2] However, as the 1847 Privy Council recommendations seemed to have been forgotten soon after their issuance, statements by the Chairman of the Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference--of which group Oldham was Secretary--regarding the development of African education appear of more immediate relevance:

---

[1] See George Bennett, Kenya, A Political History (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), pp. 63-67.

[2] In 1915 Frederick Lugard, then Governor of Nigeria, had spoken of the need to adapt education to the needs of the pupils. See Frederick Lugard, The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa (Edinburgh: William Blackwell and Sons, 1923), p. 431; and Education Ordinance of Nigeria, 1916 (Lagos: Government Printer, 1917).

> This Committee believes that everywhere the best experience warrants the assertion that for the Negro race all education ought to have an industrial basis. . . . It is noteworthy that all the most successful experiments in Negro education, e.g., in South Africa and in the Southern States of America . . . have been based upon the gospel of work and its application, as part of the school curriculum, in agriculture, and handicrafts. . . . Industrial education seems to have a special application to the education of the Child Race, whose "mental digestion" is weak and who are more successful in getting knowledge than in using it. . . .[3]

Lest this be judged an aberration, note should be taken of the follow-up to this memorandum, this time to the Colonial Secretary, some two months later:

---

[1] Eric Ashby, Universities: British, Indian, African (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1966), p. 156.

[2] The text of this 1847 report is sumarized in H. S. Scott, "The Development of the Education of the African in Relation to Western Contact," Yearbook of Education, 1938 (London: Evans Brothers, 1938), pp. 693-739, and especially pp. 707-711.

[3] "Some Principles of African Education," by the Chairman of the Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference, February 10, 1914, Edinburgh House, Box: West African Education and General.

> The low state of his [the African's] civilisation and the effect on his mind of centuries of barbarous lawlessness and cruelty specially point to the need of education in the value of manual labour. . . .[1]

If, as appears the case, Jones had settled on the type of education applicable for Africans in West, Central and South Africa before he left Liverpool on August 25, 1920,[2] it should be remembered that his recommendations were not to fall on unsympathetic ears. The Colonial Office needed an African education policy, but there was little of relevance in British experience on which to draw. Jones' emphasis in his two African reports on agricultural and technical education and the four Simples would provide not only an educational policy for the Colonial Office, but a pedagogical creed which would complement its political philosophy of Indirect Rule as well. An education adapted to African needs would provide leaders whose primary concern would be for the betterment of their people and who would

---

[1] Letter, A. H. L. Fraser to Lord Harcourt, April 3, 1914, Edinburgh House, Box: West African Education and General.

[2] Letter, A. W. Wilkie to J. H. Oldham, December 8, 1920, Edinburgh House Box D-18. "Jones is splendid on his own subject. He has, however, a rather pronounced tendency to pre-judge; to assume that certain characteristics will be present and then to discover them! I was rather shocked when he began to write a report on the Gold Coast, with recommendations, when he had visited only one outpost--Kumase. And all along, I have to try to get him to defer judgement until he has actually seen work. . . . One rather disturbing characteristic is a reluctance to study documents! and its effect is that later on he finds out that certain methods are already adopted which he thought were absent. . . . He thinks that methods from which we departed twenty years ago are still holding the field. . . ."

130

not be estranged from African life.[1] His recommendations were hardly novel; however, his reports did serve to crystallize educational opinion in the United Kingdom--which had long been searching for a focal point--around a theory which had an educational as well as a political rationale.

The African Education Commission left England on August 25, 1920, and embarked from South Africa on March 15, 1921. In between it visited Sierre Leone, Liberia, the Gold Coast, Nigeria, Cameroons, the Belgian Congo, and Angola. The report was written exclusively by Jones and reads like the report on Negro education, only with a different locale. His general recommendations deal with the adaptations of education to meet local conditions, the incorporation of the four Simples into the curricula at all levels, the need to develop a sense of community consciousness among the indigenous people, the overriding importance of agricultural and simple industrial training, the need for better school supervision, the necessity of cooperation between missions and governments for African education, and the need to differentiate between education for the leaders and for the masses of Africans.[2]

---

[1] Thomas Jesse Jones, Education in Africa: A Study of West, South and Equatorial Africa, by the African Education Commission (New York: Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1922), p. 17; and Thomas Jesse Jones, Education in East Africa: A Study of East, Central and South Africa by the Second African Education Commission under Auspices of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, in cooperation with the International Education Board (London: Edinburgh House Press, 1925), p. 10.

[2] Jones, Education in Africa, pp. 18-25.

Character development and the religious life of the pupils were adjudged the most important ends of education. Indeed, "education is . . . not merely the imparting of facts but the interpretation of Divinity in human affairs."[1] And since character is very much the result of habits, which are more certain when developed through mechanical experiences than through the literary subjects, the curricula of the African schools should stress the vocational rather than the academic subjects.[2] Religion was to be best served by tilling the land, for, in Jones' opinion, "the cultivation of the soil is co-working with God."[3]

Under the heading of 'Educational Supervision' Jones recommended that each colony create an advisory Board of Education, which would bring together representatives of Government and the mission societies. The Jeanes Fund system of supervisory teachers was suggested as a most efficacious method of ensuring that village schools received adequate surveillance.

It is noteworthy how closely Jones' plans for a dual educational structure in Africa--education of the masses on one level and education of native leadership on another--paralleled that system which was created for Negroes in the Southern United States as a result of the Capon Springs Conferences at the close of the nineteenth century. Education for the African masses--as for the Negro masses--was to be simple, utilitarian, and rooted to a strong agricultural bias. For the native leadership there would be, first, training for teachers and religious workers; second, instruction for those who would specialize in agriculture and industry; and third, training for those who would enter the professions of medicine, theology, engineering, and law. Even for this elite group, however, there would be a strong emphasis on agricultural and simple industrial subjects, hygiene and sanitation, gardening and rural economics before the professional training commenced.[1]

---

[1] Jones, Education in Africa, p. 28.

[2] "Diary of the African Education Commission," copy at Phelps-Stokes Fund, p. 78. (Typewritten.) Lugard also felt that character training and habit formation were the most important ends of African education; however, he did not maintain that manual and agricultural training were the sole means to the goal. See Lugard, The Dual Mandate, p. 431.

[3] Jones, Education in Africa, p. 28.

When discussing 'Cooperation for the Education of Africans,' Jones pointed out that the mercantile interests in the various colonies could have achieved better returns from their investments if only they had realized the relationship between their economic activities and the general welfare of the Africans and the colony.[2] Here he gives the impression that the profits of the commercial concerns is almost as important as African welfare. The colonial governments must work more closely with the mission societies, and the societies themselves must demonstrate a greater degree of cooperation than heretofore, if the monumental problems of African education are to be overcome.[1]

---

[1] Jones, Education in Africa, pp. 59-71.

[2] Ibid., p. 83.

If these were the general recommendations embodied in Education in Africa, what were the specifics of Jones' program? A glance at his proposals for the Gold Coast will provide, in capsulated form, some idea of what adapted education meant on the West Coast, and a brief examination of the difficulties of implementation will give some insight into the impracticability besetting his concept of education.

Jones met with Sir Gordon Guggisberg, the Governor of the Gold Coast, and his staff on November 1, 1920, at which time he outlined the educational needs of the Gold Coast together with his recommendations.[2] Included among the former was the statement that

> the curriculum should provide: Three R's; hygiene; the soil; simple industries, including wood and iron work for boys, and household activities for girls; simple virtues as accuracy, perseverence, order, cleanliness, honesty, parental respect. . . .

The other major need of the Colony was the expansion of the school system. In order that education be adapted to the needs of the pupils, Jones recommended that public and private officials should initiate a propaganda campaign to create public opinion favorable to adaptation. He further advocated that the Colony should utilize the experiences gained by other countries in adaptation, and, to this end, should send

---

[1] Jones, Education in Africa, pp. 89-94.

[2] "Diary of the African Education Commission," pp. 54-56.

"carefully selected men for observation and training to those countries."[1]

Special training was proposed for the following groups: (1) teachers with an appreciation of native life, and thoroughly devoted to the adaptation of education and community service; (2) agriculturalists in rural development; (3) technical workers trained to be either teachers of wood and iron work in smaller school, or mechanics prepared to carry on in their villages; (4) community health workers; (5) women trained to teach the essentials of a good home and to carry on a campaign for infant and child welfare.[2]

Two days earlier Jones had dined with the Governor and had discussed with him specific ways to upgrade the Colony's school system. They agreed that there existed a need to change the emphasis of education from the traditionally literary interests of the English system to the more practical methods of the American system. This could be accomplished by the establishment of educational contact with selected American schools. More concretely, Jones suggested: (1) that the Gold Coast should send four or six young native men, selected by missionary schools, to study the Hampton and Tuskegee methods of education; (2) that three or four young native women in community health work be sent to train at Dixie Hospital, an affiliate of Hampton; (3) that some thirty Englishmen, educational and

---

[1] "Diary of the African Education Commission," p. 54.

[2] Ibid., p. 55.

Governmental workers, be sent to America to observe the best American systems of Negro education, as well as the work of the United States Department of Agriculture; and (4) that a hand-picked Hampton or Tuskegee graduate "of poise and ability" be sent to the Gold Coast to initiate some practical methods for the education of the rural natives.[1]

If additional evidences of Jones' anti-literary and anti-urban biases are required, one need search no further than his comments on several schools visited by the Commission. The Assuanti Rural School at Cape Coast had been founded on the appeal of a local chief who felt the need for agricultural training for the youth of the area. Jones could only lament the fact that, as the chief's interest in the school waned, "the boys and parents are . . . influenced by the prevailing belief in literary education."[2] Of the Government Teacher Training School in Accra he felt that "the course is rather literary. Hygiene is well taught. The boys have little appreciation of rural problems and rural needs. . . . Curriculum, teaching, and school setting are all too urban."[3] Even the Government Agricultural Experiment Station at Kumasi did not meet Jones' high standards, presumably because no provision was made for instruction in the raising of such animals as sheep, goats, pigs, and chickens. The fact that the instructor relied heavily on the experimental method of instruction rather than the expository method was a contributing factor to his displeasure, but exactly why is somewhat questionable, especially in view of his penchant for demonstration.[1]

---

[1] "Diary of the African Education Commission," p. 52; also Letter, Jones to Oldham, November 10, 1920, Edinburgh House Box 214; and Letter, Jones to Guggisberg, November 20, 1920, Edinburgh House Box: West African Education, General.

[2] "Diary of the African Education Commission," p. 33. Although this school was discussed in some detail in the Diary, it is not mentioned in the published report.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

Nor was Jones exactly complimentary about the two independent schools he visited. The first, run by "a native named Graves," was distinguished by the great amount of time given to the teaching of the classics and the fact that the raison d'etre for the institution seemed to be the passing of the Cambridge University Local Examinations. Despite the fact that a number of intelligent local people believed this school to be of some importance, Jones characterized it as "exceedingly poor," and said that it should not be encouraged.[2] Nor was he pleased with Reverend Mark Hayford's Baptist School in Accra which, he noted, should only receive donations through a well-known organization with powers to supervise its expenditures.[3]

On the other hand, he expressed enthusiasm for those institutions which inclined towards the Hampton-Tuskegee educational model. One of these was the Akropong Seminary, the Basel Mission Center for the training of teachers on the Gold Coast. The course of study included the usual school subjects, with special attention given to school methods and hand and eye work. Agricultural instruction was included for two years and was given at the Aburi Agricultural Station. Jones noted with satisfaction that "the pupils' appreciation of community needs in education was above the average," and with gratification that the head teacher had given considerable time to the study of the life and works of Booker T. Washington.[1]

---

[1] "Diary of the African Education Commission," p. 26.

[2] Ibid., pp. 30-31.

[3] Ibid., p. 37.

Jones had nothing but contempt for "the educated natives of the coast, who resemble the graduates of the literary schools in America, with their interest in traditional subjects," and who were so unrepresentative of the Gold Coast peoples.[2] Juxtaposed against these coastal upstarts were the traditional chiefs who, Jones was convinced as a result of interviews with them, were "vitally interested in the common needs of the people."[3] In order to shore up their waning authority vis-a-vis the growing power of the intelligentsia--and to ensure the propagation of his educational creed simultaneously--Jones, with Aggrey's approval, felt that the colonial government and the missionary societies should assist these chiefs to present their point of view to England and America. He suggested that each of these men[4] receive "books, reports and papers from Hampton,

---

[1] "Diary of the African Education Commission," p. 41.

[2] Ibid., pp. 45-46. [3] Ibid., p. 45.

[4] In particular, Oferi Ata of Akyem; Konor Mate Kola of Odumase; and the Omanhene of Assuantsi.

Tuskegee, the General Education Board, the Phelps-Stokes Fund, and similar organizations interested in the realities of education."[1]

But, given the realities--political, economic, and social--of the Gold Coast in the 1920's, there was little chance that the recommendations of the Phelps-Stokes Commission could have been implemented. Had Jones been more attuned to the climate of opinion of the intelligentsia, which set the tone for current opinion notwithstanding his disdain for, and avoidance of, it, and less impressed by the official rhetoric which could not be transferred into policy,[2] perhaps he would have understood the impracticability of his scheme. However, grappling with current realities and African aspirations were not really his forte.

As early as the 1920's, when the Phelps-Stokes Education Commissions were in Africa, it was becoming obvious that

> Western education . . . [had become] the most visible and tangible manifestation of European power, hence access to that power demanded entry to the type of education provided in the metropole itself.[3]

The attempt to transfer the methods of Negro education of the American South, with the racial connotations rather than a sociological basis, to the Gold Coast is a good example of the danger inherent in the attempt to graft a formal educational policy onto a foreign milieu without first ascertaining if the necessary ingredients for a successful transplantation are present. Since it was exclusively through the medium of an academic education, as opposed to an agricultural or technical one, that an individual had access to the most prestigious and highly paid occupations, it would appear that demands for academic education were totally realistic in the local milieu, given the nature of the reward system--economically, socially, and even politically.[1] Had the colonial government, in the Gold Coast or elsewhere, made the rewards of an agricultural or narrowly vocational training superior to those of an academic education, there is every likelihood that the indigenous people would have responded with enthusiasm to that training. However, as African aspirations were largely determined by their points of reference and the opportunities available within the occupational structure, and since these were Europeans and white collar jobs, it was somewhat unrealistic to assume that a wave of the policy wand could transform aspirations from academic to agricultural and/or technical education without a similar transformation of the social and economic system of the colony. "In characterizing Africans as having a 'curious belief' that manual labour was undignified there was the blithe disregard of the fact that it was also less well paid."[2]

---

[1] "Diary of the African Education Commission," p. 46.

[2] Guggisberg, in A Review of the Events of 1922-1923 (Accra: Government Printer, 1924), p. 110, spoke of Education in Africa as "the book of the century, a combination of sound idealism and practical common sense. . . ."

[3] Philip Foster, Education and Social Change in Ghana (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965), p. 136.

---

[1] This argument is adapted from Foster, Education and Social Change in Ghana, pp. 133-135.

[2] Ibid., p. 151. With regard to agricultural education, Foster notes, p. 155, that "as with technical education the success of agricultural studies was largely dependent upon real opportunities being created in the economic and social environment of the Gold Coast."

Viewing several of the basic assumptions of the Phelps-Stokes Commission against the realities of the Gold Coast in the 1920's will provide some idea of the incongruities involved. The first general recommendation of the Commission was that the educational systems of Africa should, since the overwhelming majority of the Africans must live on and by the soil, be based upon agricultural curricula.[1] Supplementing this could be a system of elementary trade schools, designed to teach the rudimentary trades required in native villages and to prepare semi-skilled labor for industry.[2] In view of the fact that the people of the Gold Coast were likely to be less than enamoured of a school system which did not provide the social and economic mobility which they deemed desirable, it is not surprising that these most important recommendations--curricular reform--were stillborn. This type of education "combined inferior opportunities with the notion of tying the bulk of the Africans to the land,"[3] and, as such, was bound to be rejected out of hand.

Jones' theory of educational adaptation had more to it than merely the provision of a more practical and relevant education. Implicit in this educational rhetoric was a theory to govern the rate of social change, something which could hardly be legislated into existence by a sympathetic Governor. The adaptation of texts, and lessons in history, geography, arithmetic and other school subjects so that they were more closely related to local conditions was praiseworthy in some respects; however, the fact that Jones recommended that students study only the history or institutions of their own lands raises the question if there was not a conscious effort to close the door of Western knowledge to the mass of Africans so that they might be preserved in their pristine state.[1] But for a society which had already opted for the academic form of education--for a variety of reasons--the attempt to confine the curriculum to the immediate environs was bound to be sterile.

---

[1] Jones, Education in Africa, p. 20.

[2] Ibid., p. 71.

[3] Foster, Education and Social Change in Ghana, p. 162.

Although the recommendations of the African Education Commission were received enthusiastically at most official levels in the Gold Coast, the reactions of the Africans, who had hardly been consulted, were to be instrumental in determining whether or not the recommendations would be implemented. Jones did not reckon that African opinion mattered, a conviction with which the colonial government concurred. And yet, it was improbable, as Foster notes,[2] that African pressure for educational parity could be denied at the time the Commission arrived in the colony. But if the recommendations of this first Phelps-Stokes Commission had a negligible effect on the educational system of the Gold Coast, its efforts were to be crowned with greater success on a much broader scale.

---

[1] Foster, Education and Social Change in Ghana, p. 162.

[2] Ibid., p. 165.

14?

Education in Africa appeared just as Oldham realized that the day was near when the British Government would have to assume greater responsibility in the field of African education. Desirous of assuring that the Protestant mission societies, which were represented through the International Missionary Council, should continue to play a key role in this venture, he approached the Colonial Office early in 1923 with the suggestion that he draft a memorandum dealing with the subject of African education.[1] Since the Colonial Office was responsible for Africa, he felt that here was where pressure must be exerted.[2]

Pointing out that some 90 percent of the education in Africa was in the hands of the missionary societies, Oldham argued that the only sensible policy would be one which provided for cooperation between these societies and the Government. In this, of course, he was strongly reinforced by Jones' report. Cooperation, in the form of grants-in-aid to qualifying mission schools, would not only be cheaper than the creation of a secular school system but would also ensure the provision of a religious education which, he agreed with the Phelps-Stokes Commission, was fundamental if African traditional values were not to be undermined.[3] Cooperation, which one ecclesiastic felt was "quite vital to the advancement of the child races,"[1] was the lynchpin upon which the new governmental policy was to swing, and Oldham did what he could to ensure that the personnel of the new committee could be imbued with the cooperative spirit.

---

[1] Letter, Oldham to W. G. A. Ormsby-Gore, March 13, 1923; and Letter, Oldham to Arthur Mayhew, April 12, 1923, Edinburgh House Box 219.

[2] Letter, Oldham to Jones, March 23, 1923, Edinburgh House Box 219.

[3] Oldham's plan was outlined in a memorandum entitled "Educational Policy in Africa," dated April 3, 1923, Edinburgh House Box 219.

In May, 1923, a preliminary conference was held at the Colonial Office between Ormsby-Gore, the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies; the Governors of Sierre Leone, the Gold Coast, and Nigeria; Oldham; and Jones, who had come specially from New York to attend this and subsequent meetings.[2] In view of the importance attached to Education in Africa, it was not surprising that Oldham suggested that Jones, despite the obstacles of his American citizenship, be considered for the post of Secretary of the newly-created British Advisory Committee on Native Education in Tropical Africa.[3] Ormsby-Gore, however, demurred.[4]

The debt owed to the Phelps-Stokes Education Commission was summed up most succinctly by Ormsby-Gore when he announced the creation of the new Committee in the House of Commons:

---

[1] Letter, Bishop of Salisbury to Oldham, April 21, 1923, Edinburgh House Box 219.

[2] Jones arrived in London on May 10, 1923, after considerable urging from Oldham that his presence was required, Edinburgh House Box 219.

[3] Letter, Oldham to Ormsby-Gore, June 8, 1923, Edinburgh House Box 219.

[4] Letter, Ormsby-Gore to Oldham, June 9, 1923, Edinburgh House Box 219; and Oldham to C. T. Loram, June 28, 1923, Edinburgh House Box H-15.

> We want to explore the experience of the world as to what is the best and most helpful form and type of education that we can give to the African. . . . We have formed a permanent Committee. . . . We were led to this largely as a result of a most extraordinarily interesting report issued by Dr. Jesse Jones. . . . He has made a most helpful contribution to the subject of African education from the native point of view.[1]

The Advisory Committees met for the first time in January, 1924, and Ormsby-Gore expressed to Jones the gratitude felt not only by the Committee, but by the British Government as well towards the Phelps-Stokes Fund Trustees for the work which they had carried out in West Africa.[2]

The initial publication of the Advisory Committee, written by Oldham, was issued in 1925, and is a further indication of how thought on both sides of the Atlantic had come together. On the adaptation of education to native life, it says:

> Education should be adapted to the mentality, aptitudes, occupations, and traditions of the various peoples. . . . Its aim should be to . . . promote the advancement of the community as a whole through the improvement of agriculture, the development of native industries, and the improvement of health . . . and the inculcation of the true ideals of citizenship and service. . . .[3]

The African intelligentsia on the West Coast, and particularly on the Gold Coast, immediately took its stand against the Advisory Committee and, by extension, against the Phelps-Stokes recommendations. Pointing out that it was one thing to set up a body of enlightened Africans to devise an educational scheme for their practical needs and quite another to appoint a committee of Europeans to formulate educational policy for a subject race, one Gold Coast newspaper stated that Africans would only be satisfied with an education which "will fit them to take their rightful place in the council of nations. . . ."[1] Another noted that "the tendency still among those who should be better informed is to regard all Africans as children under European tutelage and for whom things are to be done without even consulting them or seeking their point of view." And as a warning, it added that no attempt should be made by the Committee to circumscribe the limits or the range of African education.[2] But as these views were being aired, the Phelps-Stokes Fund, buoyed by the enthusiastic official reception of its initial African Education report[3] and bowing to

---

[1] Great Britain, Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 167 (1923), p. 504.

[2] Great Britain, Public Record Office, C.O. 879/121, no. 1100, Minutes of the First Meeting of the Advisory Committee on Native Education in Tropical Africa, January 9, 1924.

[3] Educational Policy in British Tropical Africa, 1925, xxi, cmd. 2374, p. 4.

---

[1] Gold Coast Times, February 16, 1924, p. 7.

[2] Gold Coast Leader, February 16, 1924, p. 4.

[3] The white press, in the United Kingdom and America, was generally very favorable to Education in Africa. See particularly reviews by P. W. Wilson in The New York Times Book Review, December 24, 1922; J. H. Dillard in the New York Evening Post, November 18, 1922, Basil Mathews in The Methodist Recorder, March 8, 1923; Oldham in The International Review of Missions, April, 1925. But a discordant note was sounded by C. H. Thompson in the June, 1923, issue of Opportunity, A Journal of Negro Life. He said, in part: "The Commission recommends that, wherever possible, the example of Tuskegee and Hampton be followed as working plans for African education. . . . We wonder, in the first place, whether the situations are sufficiently analogous; in the second place, if the scheme has been successful to the extent that it would justify copying it; or finally whether it would be to the ultimate advantage of the Africans?"

British pressures for a sequel, had already dispatched a Commission to prepare a survey of education in East and Central Africa.[1]

## The Second Education Commission

The personnel of this second Commission was considerably more prestigous than that of its predecessor. Realizing that the newly-created British Advisory Committee on Native Education in Tropical Africa would play a central role in the formation of official African education policy in the forseeable future, Jones insisted that the Committee's Secretary lend his influence as a member of the Commission. It hardly mattered that the man selected for the job, Hanns Vischer, was the third choice, and one of which Jones did not approve.[2] The Educational Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, Reverend

---

[1] The Executive Committee of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, at a meeting September 20, 1923, outlined the terms of reference of the East African Educational Commission, as well as the conditions to be met before the Trustees final approval could be secured. The main points can be found in Education in East Africa, pp. xviii-xix.

[2] Letter, Jones to F. P. Keppel, November 7, 1923, Carnegie Corporation file on the Phelps-Stokes Fund; Oldham to the Bishop of Liverpool, November 7, 1923; Vischer to Oldham, November 9, 1923; and Herbert Read to Oldham, December 28, 1923, Edinburgh House Box E-18. Oldham detailed two sine qua non for the job: (1) the Secreatry should have an instinctive appreciation of the difference of race and the power to know what another race is thinking; and (2) he should have studied Negro education thoroughly, Oldham to Loram, June 28, 1923, Edinburgh House, Box H-15. Because he did not fulfill the second requisite, Vischer was sent to America for a fast tour in November, 1923. Some details of Vischer's early career can be found in Sonia Graham, Mission and Government Education in Northern Nigeria, 1900-1919, with Special Reference to the Work of Hanns Vischer (Ibadan: Ibadan University Press, 1966).

147

Garfield Williams, was a member, as was the president of the Jeanes Fund, James H. Dillard, whom Oldham termed "one of the most influential men in the Southern States."[1] James W. C. Dougall, later to play a key role in a Phelps-Stokes experiment in Kenya, was attached to the Commission as Secretary. Rounding out the group were Dillard's son George; Homer Shantz, an agriculturalist and botanist with the United States Department of Agriculture; Loram; and Aggrey.

After several weeks in England, the Commissioners sailed for East Africa at the end of January, 1924. During the next six months they visited--at times individually--Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, Zanzibar, Nyasaland, Mozambique, Southern and Northern Rhodesia, and South Africa.

Given the publication of Education in Africa two years earlier, the personnel of the Commission to East Africa, and the common outlook of Jones and those responsible for educational policy in British Africa, this second Commission could hardly have produced a novel document. Once again Jones gave primary emphasis to his four Essentials of education and their relationship to the needs of the community. He topped off the four Essentials with a discourse on that panacea of colonial educationalists--character training.[2] Hoping to deflect the criticism that he made no provision for higher education, Jones discussed the need for advanced technical and agricultural training, as well as professional knowledge of law, medicine, and theology. He quickly qualified this, however, by pointing out that all higher training should be the handmaiden of the four Essentials, and that these should largely determine the type of professional education to be encouraged.[1]

---

[1] Letter, Oldham to the Bishop of Liverpool, December 19, 1923, Edinburgh House Box E-18.

[2] Jones, Education in East Africa, pp. 7-14.

The place of agricultural and simple technical training still reigned supreme. He lashed out at those European industrial complexes which lured the African away from the simple truth of the soil to the "artificialities of the labor compound,"[2] but neglected to note that these "artificialities" provided one of the few opportunities for the African to earn that currency in which the recently imposed British hut tax had to be tendered.

More than training in crafts, however, agricultural education was at the heart of Jones' East African educational reform, and was the key to education for life.

> The most essential requisite of all is a genuine belief in agriculture, a recognition of its vital contribution to the life of the community, a realization of its value in the physical, mental, and even moral welfare of the Native people.[3]

For the students to realize the true importance of husbandry, it was necessary that the schools cease to give the impression that the usual subjects in the curriculum were of more importance than agricultural knowledge.[1]

---

[1] Jones, Education in East Africa, p. 8.

[2] Ibid., p. 37.

[3] Ibid., p. 40.

If Jones' theories of education adaptation found a sympathetic and interested audience in London, it was no less true that the reception was, if anything, equally enthusiastic in most of the East and Central African colonies themselves--at least on the official level. Representative of those who felt that Jones had struck the right educational note was the Governor of Northern Rhodesia. In a memorandum to the Colonial Office dealing with education in the colony, he acknowledged that his views were based largely upon conversations with Jones.[2]

Jones had noted that the "improvement of the Village Schools should be the first responsibility of the colonial authorities,"[3] and one of the best means towards this end lay in better supervision or, more particularly, better visiting teachers modelled after the itinerant Jeanes teachers in the Southern United States.[4] Despite the shortage of funds, Stanley minuted that the quality of teaching in the village schools could be improved if, in accordance with the plans suggested by Jones, the village schools were visited, and the local teachers' work supervised and guided by natives trained specially for that purpose in Central Mission Schools.[1]

---

[1] Jones, Education in East Africa, p. 37.

[2] Letter, H. J. Stanley to J. H. Thomas, September 25, 1924, Edinburgh House Box 230.

[3] Jones, Education in East Africa, p. 59.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 50 and 54-55.

The Colonial Secretary of Kenya was no less enthusiastic about the potential of the Jeanes idea in East Africa, and not solely for reasons of pedagogical expediency.

> I believe you have here [with the Jeanes teachers] the very best chance in the whole of Africa of educating an intelligent, cheerful, self-respecting, and generally docile and willing-to-learn African native on simple, straightforward and satisfying lines to the benefit of himself and the whole country. . . .[2]

Nor were the political dividends of Jones' program of adapted education lost on other colonial administrators in East and Central Africa. The Director of Education in Tanganyika, however, was not in accord with Jones' educational pronouncements although he did recognize the necessity of directing the education of the native agriculturalist along lines which would make him "happy and content with his lot on the land."[3]

---

[1] Letter, Stanley to J. H. Thomas, September 25, 1924, Edinburgh House Box 230.

[2] Letter, Edward B. Denham to Jones, June 4, 1924, Edinburgh House Box 232.

[3] Stanley Rivers-Smith, May 23, 1924, "Reflections on T. J. Jones' Advance Report," Edinburgh House Box 232. In fairness to Rivers-Smith, it should be noted that he had composed a comprehensive plan for education in Tanganyika long before the arrival of the Education Commission in 1924. This plan included literary education at the top, looking forward to a real secondary school standard and a more broadly based social program at the bottom. Tanganyika in the early 1920's still had a strong legacy of German educational policy, which rested much more on official incentives than did the more missionary-dominated education of most of British Africa. Consequently, Tanganyika did not need the advice of outside 'experts' for clues to its future educational policy; this policy was rooted in the German colonial heritage. In light of this background it is not surprising that Rivers-Smith would dissent from the educational pronouncements of Jones, et al. I am grateful to Dr. Marcia Wright of Columbia University for these insights into the educational legacy of Tanganyika. Personal communication to the author, October 28, 1969.

151

The Director of Native Development in Southern Rhodesia, H. S. Keigwin, was one of Jones' staunchest advocates, arguing that all Africans should be trained to a due appreciation of their industrial and agricultural possibilities. This, he felt, was the only hope of minimizing "that annoying conceit and self-assertiveness that unfortunately is so often the mark of the 'book-learned' native."[1] He recognized that this meant a 'special' education for the African, one which would place him permanently in a niche from which he could move only with the greatest difficulty. But, by the same token, there is some evidence that Jones had a similar thought in mind, disclaimers notwithstanding. The Governor of Northern Rhodesia wrote that Jones had urged "very strongly that the direction of Native Education should not be in the same direction as European Education, and he convinced me of the correctness of that view."[2] Jones had advised Stanley that the new Director of Native Education in Northern Rhodesia could study the proper kind of African education by visiting the so-called Keigwin schools in Southern Rhodesia as well as some of Loram's schools in Natal.

But not all educators in Southern Rhodesia felt that the Keigwin-Jones educational program was the best one. The Southern Rhodesian Mission Conference expressed its indignation at what it considered unfair treatment of the mission schools by Jones in Education in Africa, and believed that "the treatment given to the Keigwin scheme," described as the "most helpful influence [in education], disproportionate and biased. . . ."[1] Jones passed off this criticism as an "interesting controversy."[2]

---

[1] H. S. Keigwin, "Native Development," Memorandum, n.d., but c. 1921, Edinburgh House Box H-21.

[2] Letter, H. J. Stanley to J. H. Thomas, September 25, 1924, Edinburgh House Box 230.

Although many people in the territories visited in 1924 had evolved ideas not dissimilar to those advocated by Jones, there was little chance that the curricular reforms could be implemented, for reasons similar to those which precluded such a course in the Gold Coast.[3] But with several other recommendations--of a more practical nature--Jones enjoyed a greater degree of success. One of these was the creation of the post of Director of Native Education in several colonies; another involved the creation of local Advisory Committees on Native Education, more particularly in Kenya; and a third was the founding of schools to train Jeanes teachers.[1]

---

[1] Letter, Latimer P. Hardaker to Oldham, August 8, 1923, Edinburgh House Box "West African Education General." Jones' comments on education in Southern Rhodesia can be found on pp. 199-200 and 217-220 of Education in Africa.

[2] Letter, Jones to Oldham, September 15, 1923, Edinburgh House Box "West African Education and General."

[3] Jones, Education in East Africa, pp. 50-53 and 55. Although curricular reform along lines prescribed by Jones was hard to measure, it should be noted that the General Missionary Conference of Northern Rhodesia, at its meeting in June, 1924, which Jones attended, resolved that each mission should devote more attention to the four Essentials of education as outlined by Dr. Jones. See Proceedings of the General Missionary Conference of Northern Rhodesia, 1924 (Lovedale: Lovedale Institute Press, 1925), p. 29. Also, the Kenya Missionary Council, in a memorandum dated November, 1924, urged the Government "to pay more attention to the masses of the Africans, and that to this end more money should be allocated for the provision of village schools, namely, money towards the salaries of teachers and equipment necessary for carrying out of the 'Agriculture and Gardening'; and that 'Industrial Skills,' which they consider so important, and which is impossible without the necessary finances." Dr. and Mrs. Emory Ross, who were missionaries with the Congo Disciples Mission in the Belgian Congo when the first African Education Commission passed through, told the writer in May, 1968, how they tried to implement the four Essentials after the visit.

Jones felt that, on the whole, the influence of the white settlers in East Africa had been beneficial to the Africans.[2] Certain of the manifest destiny of the British Empire, he stated that "British settlement is absolutely essential to the development of Africa and Africans."[3] This conclusion was based on the similarities he saw between interracial problems in America and Africa, and the beneficient effects on American blacks by their white countrymen. But even one of his closest collaborators felt that Jones was being overly sanguine regarding the beneficience of the White settlers of Kenya and Southern Rhodesia vis-a-vis the Africans, and stated that it would not do to imply that there were no blemishes on the record.[4]

---

[1] For a detailed discussion of the evolution of the school at Kabete, Kenya, to train Jeanes teachers, see Richard D. Heyman, "The Role of Carnegie Corporation of New York in African Education, 1925-1960" (forthcoming doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University); and also Kenneth J. King, "The American Negro Background of the Phelps-Stokes Commissions and Their Influence in East Africa, Especially in Kenya" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh University, 1968), Chapter VI.

[2] Jones, Education in East Africa, pp. 135 and 230-231.

[3] Letter, Jones to Ormsby-Gore, September 8, 1925, Phelps-Stokes Fund file L-7.

[4] Letter, Georgiana Gollock to Anson Phelps Stokes, January 15, 1924, Phelps-Stokes Fund file L-1.

On both tours of Africa Jones managed to work very closely with the various mission groups; indeed, he often brought together denominational factions which hitherto had been on less than friendly terms. This success was due in large measure, no doubt, to the strong religious overtones with which his educational pronouncements were laced. That education was to be Christian in character was in keeping with the precepts of the Phelps-Stokes Fund. Indeed, Anson Phelps Stokes noted that the Education Commission "can see no hopeful future for Africa unless the forces of Christian education are greatly strengthened."[1]

His puritanical orientation made Jones feel uncomfortable at the necessity of attending the horse races--"for the first time in my life"--with Guggisberg in Accra, and led him to inveigh--on the basis of what empirical data is unclear--against "the moonlight orgies and other forms of sensuous excesses so well known in many parts of Africa."[2] He felt religion and character training were inextricably linked, and, to have its full influence religion must permeate all the activities of the school. He also felt Christian ideals were a great transforming power among nations and peoples of the world and lamented that the typical history curriculum neglected to take cognizance of this.[3] Monogamy was superior to polygamy and, by extension,

---

[1] Jones, Education in Africa, p. xxiv.

[2] Ibid., p. 25; and Education in East Africa, p. 8.

[3] Jones, Education in East Africa, pp. 15-19.

Christianity to Islam. These sentiments were not always explicit, and Miss Gollock, his London collaborator, pointed out that the report on East Africa could render a singular service, beyond its purely educational one, if it would suggest that sound educational principles were inseparable from Christianity.[1] But not even all the colonial officials were in accord with the principle that the best education had to have a Christian basis.[2]

Certain of the rectitude of their advocacy and somewhat smug in their cloak of Christian self-righteousness, Jones and the Phelps-Stokes Fund reacted initially with incredulity and later with some bitterness at the numerous critical appraisals of the two African Education Commissions. Much of this criticism was passed off as the product of "anti-British and anti-Christian influence," which could not carry weight with "thoughtful Americans."[3] While he might blunt the edge of Woodson's and DuBois' attacks with this argument, there was little chance that Jones could do the same with two other critics, both of whom were not only British but had worked in the colonies and were known to be devoutly Christian.

Norman Leys mounted a forceful campaign against Jones' educational program for Africa shortly before the publication of Education in East Africa. Characterizing Jones' program as "hoary antiquity," Leys predicted that just as Napoleon had been unsuccessful in excluding political and speculative subjects from the colleges of France, so would the authorities in Kenya be unsuccessful if they attempted to implement Jones' scheme. Charging that many of Jones' ideas were deliberately vague, he noted that the most distinctive was that scholastic education was unfitting for the African, who should be instructed merely in agriculture and handicrafts.[1] He chastised Jones for covering up the special political and industrial problems in Kenya with smooth phrases, and added that "the [black] leaders of the future are . . . unlikely to come out of the Special Schools you suggest."[2] For his part, Jones ascribed Leys' outburst to "incurable obsessions," which could be explained by "his avowed devotion to DuBois."[3]

---

[1] Letter, Georgiana Gollock to Anson Phelps Stokes, January 15, 1924, Phelps-Stokes Fund file L-1.

[2] See, for example, John Scott, Acting Governor, Tanganyika, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Great Britain, Public Record Office, C.O. 879/121, no. 92/4, 1 July 1924.

[3] Letter, Jones to Kenneth Maclennan, January 21, 1926, Phelps-Stokes Fund file L-1.

The criticisms by Leys and DuBois made Jones fearful that the implementation of his recommendations might be jeopardized. In mid-1926 DuBois issued an extremely negative assessment of both Commissions in The Crisis.[4] To him, the meat of Jones' thesis was that Africans should not be trained as were Europeans; on the contrary, theirs should be an education which would ensure submissiveness, peacefulness, and industriousness, thereby perpetuating white hegemony. Jones' reaction was to suggest that a carefully presented statement be prepared by Aggrey--who could hardly be charged with educational discrimination against his own people--to counteract influences unfriendly to British colonial policy.[1] Aggrey's article was never written, and Leys' attacks on the Phelps-Stokes Commission continued throughout 1926 in the British press.[2] Jones probably would have been distressed had he known that Oldham felt that most of Leys' assertions about Kenya--notwithstanding his comments on the Phelps-Stokes Commission--were correct,[3] and that he did not share Jones' belief that Leys was merely a "sentimental agitator."[4]

---

[1] Norman Leys, Kenya (London: The Hogarth Press, 1924), pp. 390-392.

[2] Letter, Leys to Jones, June 29, 1925, Edinburgh House Box 233.

[3] Letter, Jones to Oldham, July 14, 1925, Edinburgh House Box 233.

[4] W. E. B. DuBois, "Education in Africa, a Review of the African Education Committee," The Crisis, vol. 32, June, 1926.

---

[1] Letter, Jones to Oldham, July 14, 1925, Phelps-Stokes Fund file L-1. DuBois' "Worlds of Color," Foreign Affairs, vol. 3, April, 1925, was very critical of British colonial policy.

[2] See Leys to the Editor, The Manchester Guardian, October 26, 1926; Leys, "Christianity and Race: A New Policy for Missions," The Scots Observer (Glasgow), November 13, 1926. Oldham, who was in essential agreement with Leys' views as expressed in Kenya, but who felt that he misunderstood what Jones was advocating, took up the case for the defense. See Oldham to the Editor, The Manchester Guardian, October 29, 1926; Oldham, "African Education: Missions and Government," The Scots Observer (Glasgow), December 11, 1926. Also, see Oldham, "Kenya," in International Review of Missions, Vol. 14, April, 1925, p. 278.

[3] Letter, Oldham to Lionel Curtis, December 16, 1924, Edinburgh House, Box H-2.

[4] Letter, Jones to J. W. C. Dougall, February 1, 1926, Edinburgh House Box F-12.

A. Victor Murray's criticisms of the Phelps-Stokes Commissions were couched in terms somewhat different from those of Leys, but hit their mark with no less accuracy.[1] Dismissing Booker Washington's verdict of the causes of Negro advancement, Murray pointed out that Jones' adaptations were mechanical processes lacking in function. The rural society which the Phelps-Stokes Reports envisioned was a static society, which "would avoid the conflict between the new and the old by avoiding as far as possible contact with the new."[2] Murray realized that education was an integral part of social structure--not merely an appendage which hung there to be measured in diverse ways--and that it would be politically and socially disruptive to educate people, even vocationally, if the social structure did not become flexible enough to utilize the peoples' newly acquired skills. Aspirations had to be taken into account. Murray felt that Jones ignored the vital difference between social structure and education, and wanted to emphasize differentiation before equality had been attained.[3] Thus, his emphasis on one kind of education for the masses and another for the leaders.

If Jones did not understand the links between education and social structure, then he was not a very competent sociologist. A more likely explanation, however, is that he did indeed understand these links, and that his program of rural education, combined with instruction in the handicrafts, was a calculated attempt to prevent the African from attaining any measure of social, political, or economic parity with the European.

---

[1] A. Victor Murray, The School in the Bush (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1929), pp. 291-311.

[2] Ibid., p. 308.

[3] Ibid., p. 309.

Notwithstanding these criticisms which Jones and Oldham went to great lengths to deflect, and the even more bitter denunciation of the first Educational Commission by Carter G. Woodson in 1921,[1] the two Phelps-Stokes Commission Reports earned Thomas Jesse Jones a niche in the forefront of the policymakers of African education. But another reputation was also made along the travels in Africa, and an examination of the role of Aggrey, who owed so much to the Phelps-Stokes Fund, would be instructive at this juncture.

## Aggrey of Africa

James Emman Kwegyir Aggrey was born at Anamabu, Gold Coast, in 1875; twenty-three years later he arrived in New York; and in 1904, while a professor at Livingstone College in North Carolina, he met Thomas Jesse Jones, then the Chaplain of Hampton Institute, who invited him to deliver a sermon at the Institute.[2] Aggrey believed that the only way to prosper in the white man's world was to follow the precepts of the one Negro who had succeeded in the white establishment--Booker T. Washington. Nor is there evidence to suggest that he would have chosen a different path had his personal circumstances been different. Indeed, "he defined himself exactly according to the lights of the White Man's Burden, as a 'brand plucked out from fire,' and for his salvation he was grateful to the white missionaries."[1] Like Washington before him, he was to be held up as an exemplar of interracial cooperation and a living testimony to what a black man could become through that cooperation. As Jones' own plans developed, he hoped that Aggrey's links with the Fund would help to deflect the criticism of the two Negro critics, DuBois and Woodson; by the same token, what Jones and the Fund could do for him was not lost on Aggrey.[2]

---

[1] Carter G. Woodson, The History of the Negro Church (Washington, D.C.: The Associated Publishers, 1921), pp. 309-311. Woodson charged that Jones and the Fund attempted to make certain that only 'hand-picked,' 'safe' Negroes be sent to Africa from America so that the political consciousness of the Africans could not be aroused.

[2] Edwin W. Smith, Aggrey of Africa, A Study in Black and White (London: Student Christian Movement, 1929), p. 70; and The Southern Workman, XXXIV (January, 1905).

During the summer of 1904 Aggrey attended courses at Columbia University, a practice he maintained spasmodically for some fifteen years. He he came under the influence of Franklin H. Giddings, the sociologist who had had such a marked influence on the evolution of Jones' own thinking.[3] In fact, it was Jones who had recommended his mentor to Aggrey.[1] Aggrey's philosophy of cooperation with the white man, coupled with an appeal to his sense of justice and Christian fairplay, crystallized during these years. He realized that any concessions from the white man would be granted by cooperation rather than by demands. This, perhaps, partially explains his denunciations of the Marcus Garvey movement.[2] These sentiments, however, in no way precluded his thoughts on the role of the black man to the advancement of civilization.[3]

---

[1] Aryee Quaye Armah, "Pan-Africanism and the White Man's Burden," The Harvard Journal of Negro Affairs, I (December, 1965), 65.

[2] This opinion was confirmed by Aggrey's son, Rudolph, in a conversation with the writer in December, 1968.

[3] Indeed, it was probably from Giddings that Jones learned much of the theory of the manifest destiny of the Anglo-Saxons which the Phelps-Stokes Fund's Educational Director espoused. See Thomas F. Gossett, Race: The History of an Idea in America (New York: Schocken Books, 1965), pp. 312-313.

Aggrey's views on interracial cooperation and education for the Negro paralleled Jones'; this fact, coupled with Jones' desire to disarm the criticism which he felt inevitable from the "radical" Negro camp, made the selection of Aggrey for the Commission to West and South Africa imperative. Jones counted on Aggrey to play the difficult role of interpreter of interracial cooperation and adapted education to both the black and white communities in Africa.[4] The task was not an easy one; Oldham felt that it must have been a fearful strain for Aggrey to go around Africa, to see his people crying out for a chance in life while realizing at every turn how much he and his race were downtrodden.[1] However, Aggrey carried out his assignment with more than a little aplomb and continued to counsel moderation and faith in the face of blatant inequities.

---

[1] Smith, Aggrey of Africa, pp. 100-113.

[2] Ibid., p. 171; and "Diary of the African Education Commission," p. 21.

[3] To Carter G. Woodson, Aggrey wrote, July 13, 1927, that he wanted to join the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History in the hopes that he could introduce America to Africa and vice versa, as well as showing what he was trying to do at Achimota and the great role of the black man in civilization. Carter G. Woodson Papers, Library of Congress, Container 5, Folder 69.

[4] Smith, Aggrey of Africa, pp. 147-148.

His first trip with the Phelps-Stokes Commission was a personal success for him and a testimony to the concept of interracial cooperation.[2] Although he was well received everywhere on the tour, it was in South Africa that he was to reach the pinnacle of success. Assiduously avoiding discussion of political topics in public, Aggrey carried his message of cooperation from the Cape to the very heart of the Transvaal. Loram was loud in his praises.[3] Refusing to indict white South Africa, Aggrey endeared himself to many by his continual utterances that there were two sides to the racial question. Everywhere he went in South Africa, he carried the same message--blacks and whites must have patience, without which cooperation could never be achieved.[4] Echoing the words of Booker T. Washington, Aggrey told the students at the South African Native College at Fort Hare that as black people they must learn to accept help wherever they found it, to work with those who were willing to work with them, and to remember that the Anglo-Saxons, whatever their faults, had been more successful in dealing with backward races than any other in history.[1]

---

[1] Letter, Oldham to A. G. Fraser, June 17, 1924. A. G. Fraser Papers, Rhodes House Library, Oxford, Mss. British Empire S.283, Box 4.

[2] Smith, Aggrey of Africa, pp. 143-163; and "Diary of the African Education Commission," pp. 35 and 80.

[3] Smith, Aggrey of Africa, p. 171.

[4] Ibid., p. 175.

That Aggrey should be a member of the Commission to East Africa was never in doubt. Jones kept him even busier on this tour than on the previous one,[2] speaking thirty-three times in Kenya, forty-two in Uganda, eleven in Tanganyika, and thirty-four in Nyasaland.[3] With his moderate political views, his counsel of patience, and his adherence to Christian principles, Aggrey was warmly received by most people in East Africa.[4] But this enthusiasm was not universal. One educator in Zanzibar felt that the "accidents of his American education" had caused Aggrey to lose his native African dignity and obsequious manners which were so highly prized by the Europeans in East Africa. Nor did "gold teeth and tan shoes, and European dress compensate for such things."[5]

Even before he embarked for East Africa, plans were being laid for Aggrey's secondment to one of two institutions of higher education in Africa--Fort Hare in South Africa or Achimota in the Gold Coast. The Fort Hare position was discussed while he was in South Africa with the Commission in 1921,[1] and the reasons for securing this black apostle of cooperation were not solely educational. Together with the Principals of Lovedale and Fort Hare, Loram felt that it would be a distinct advantage to have a black man of Aggrey's calibre in the country if only to counteract the evil influences of some foreign natives. He was most explicit in spelling out the role Aggrey could play:

---

[1] Letter, Alexander Kerr to Oldham, June 1, 1921, Edinburgh House Box D-18.

[2] Letter, Vischer to Oldham, June 12, 1924, Edinburgh House Box E-18. "Jones is working him mercilessly. . . ."

[3] Letter, Aggrey to Oldham, May 8, 1924, Edinburgh House Box D-18.

[4] Letter, Bishop of Mombasa to Oldham, June 16, 1924; W. E. Owen to Oldham, May 23, 1924; A. G. MacAlpine to Oldham, September 30, 1924, Edinburgh House Box D-18. J. R. Fell to Oldham, August 9, 1924, Edinburgh House Box F-20.

[5] Letter, E. F. Spanton to Oldham, June 8, 1924, Edinburgh House Box D-18. These comments notwithstanding, the Universities' Mission to Central Africa, under which auspices Spanton served, was a quite equilitarian group.

> . . . we do not want Aggrey only as a teacher of education. We want him as a living example of the black man who lives the Christian life . . . , who has trod the steep path to civilisation and has not tried to get there by shortcuts, who knows the weaknesses of the blackman and can interpret them to us. We want him as an example of what can be done by work and prayer.[2]

But Oldham was insistent that Aggrey should go to Achimota, for he felt that the most important thing for African education was to initiate a first-rate experiment in West Africa which would influence the development of education in Africa by the example it set, and this could be easier to accomplish in the Gold Coast than in South Africa.[3] Achimota was envisioned as a highly selective, residential institution modelled on the lines of an English boarding school, but with some attempt made to evolve a curriculum adapted to the African environment and needs.[1] Oldham felt that a combination of his brother-in-law, Alek Fraser, and Aggrey, as the link between the Africans and the colonial government, would assure that the institution became as well known as Hampton and Tuskegee.[2]

---

[1] Smith, Aggrey of Africa, p. 183.

[2] Letter, Loram to Jones, December 21, 1923, Edinburgh House Box D-18.

[3] Letter, Oldham to Sir Herbert Read, February 22, 1924. A. G. Fraser Papers, Rhodes House Library, Oxford, Mss. British Empire 283, Box 4/1.

Although those most closely associated with the scheme--Oldham, Fraser, Jones, Guggisberg--believed Aggrey to be essential for the success of the experiment, one in particular could not forget that he had a constituency to please which was not black. Guggisberg, while lauding Aggrey as "a splendid fellow," noted that he would assure himself great popularity by making Aggrey Vice-Principal of Achimota; however, he felt that to do so would alienate most of the Europeans who would be needed to make the scheme prosper.[3] So Aggrey arrived in Accra in October, 1924, with the anomolous designation of Deputy Vice-Principal, a sinecure which, it was felt, could not offend. But this cannot be ascribed solely to discrimination, for a number of people felt that Aggrey's talents were more on the side of teaching, negotiation, and propaganda than in administrative detail, and to have left the institution in his charge during Fraser's absences might have proved disastrous.[1]

---

[1] See Foster, Education and Social Change in Ghana, pp. 166-171; R. E. Wraith, Guggisberg (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 129-160; C. Kingsley Williams, Achimota--The Early Years, 1924-1948 (Accra: Longmans, 1962); and W. E. F. Ward, Fraser of Trinity and Achimota (London: The Camelot Press, 1965).

[2] Letter, Oldham to Vischer, January 14, 1924, Edinburgh House Box E-18.

[3] Letter, Guggisberg to Oldham, March 5, 1924, Edinburgh House, Box D-18.

Within three years, and before he had a chance to live up to his potential, Aggrey died unexpectedly in New York. Thus was removed from the scene the best envoy the Phelps-Stokes Fund possessed, a man who believed whole-heartedly in the precepts of the Fund and the philosophy of its Educational Director. But this close alliance had also fostered enemies who felt that Aggrey was misusing his growing influence to perpetuate white hegemony at the expense of African independence.[2] What Aggrey would have accomplished had he lived is unknown, but it is unlikely, given the educational aspirations of the population of the Gold Coast during the 1920's and 1930's, that he would have enjoyed much success in the implementation of Jones' educational philosophy.

The accolades which the Phelps-Stokes Fund received as a result of its two African Education Commissions ensured its place in the forefront of African education during the 1920's and 1930's. Within months of the return of the East African Commission to London in 1924 attempts were initiated to codify those concepts which Jones, Oldham

---

[1] Letter, Anson Phelps Stokes to Oldham, March 17, 1924, Edinburgh House Box D-18.

[2] Rose D. Aggrey wrote to Jones, August 29, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file K-4, that "many of the Africans themselves . . . opposed his attitude, his policy, his statements on the race problem in Africa. . . ." Of her husband's feeling towards Jones, Mrs. Aggrey wrote: ". . . my husband loved you more than you knew; he had great confidence in your judgment and you. . . ."

167

and the British Advisory Committee recognized as requisites for the proper growth of African education.[1] And although the concepts were accepted as valid by a substantial number of groups and individuals in the field of African education, very few of the Phelps-Stokes Commissions' recommendations were actually implemented.

Possibly the most tangible results of the Commissions' tours were the establishment of the school for Jeanes visiting teachers in Kenya, the creation of joint government-mission advisory boards of education in several colonies, and the impetus given to the creation of the post of Director of Native Education in several other territories. The attempts to introduce a curriculum with a strong rural bias, emphasizing gardening, agriculture, and simple handicrafts was largely unsuccessful. The reluctance on the part of the Africans to accept these "adapted" values is perhaps best illustrated by the case of the Gold Coast.

The failure to take into account the political aspirations of the African peoples and the viewpoint of the intelligentsia was seen by one commentator as a deliberate attempt to isolate those elements of African society which the Phelps-Stokes Commissioners felt were radical.[2] By so doing, of course, Jones neglected the fact that in 1920 a group of West African intellectuals, calling themselves the

---

[1] See Chapter VII below.

[2] Godfrey N. Brown, "British Educational Policy in West and Central Africa," Journal of Modern African Studies, II (1964), 369.

National Congress of British West Africa, petitioned the King of England not only for constitutional changes leading to self-government, but for the establishment of a West African university as well. This and kindred groups, so assiduously ignored, were bound to be at loggerheads with Jones' program. Nor is there any evidence that the East African Commission attempted to understand, much less negotiate with, the nascent nationalism which had found its outlet in John Chilembwe's Providence Industrial Mission in Nyasaland, and the rise of the independent school movement in Kikuyu.[1] Rather than taking cognizance of these aspirations, Jones heaped praise on the role of the white settlers in East Africa, in Kenya in particular, and implied that the Africans there should consider the settler presence a boon to their development.[2] Jones could not understand what would, in subsequent years, become clear to numerous African nationalists:

> At our homes we had done a lot of ploughing, planting, weeding, and harvesting. . . . We knew how to do these things. We had come to school, not for these, but for those things we did not know. What we knew not was education; education was what we did not know.[3]

And the four Essentials, adapted to local conditions, were not seen as the means to provide the education which they did not know, but rather what they had known for many decades.

---

[1] See Carl G. Rosberg, Jr. and John Nottingham, The Myth of Mau Mau: Nationalism in Kenya (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966), pp. 125-131.

[2] Jones, Education in East Africa, pp. 101, 134-135.

[3] Ndabaningi Sithole, African Nationalism (Cape Town: Oxford University Press, 1959), pp. 7-8.

Arthur Wilkie, obviously much disturbed, wrote Jones from Accra early in 1923 that political agitation in the Gold Coast, fed by Garveyite propaganda, was becoming very noisy and vociferous and was finding Education in Africa an obvious target. It was the Gold Coast barristers, he felt, who were behind the agitation; to counter them, it might be wise "to distribute free and with discretion copies of the report to selected leaders." But the agitators were another problem because

> . . . the whole tenor of the report runs counter to their own methods and aims. They believe in agitation, . . . and to a man they are convinced that the teaching of the Classics is a sine qua non in higher education. . . .[1]

Even before going to East Africa Jones had been warned of the growth of African militancy, and of the need for propaganda which would familiarize the Africans with the aims of Tuskegee before they were prejudiced against it by American Negro associations, especially as there was evidence of correspondence between Harry Thuku and Garvey.[2] But the Thukus of East Africa were avoided as assiduously as were the Caseley-Hayfords of West Africa.

But if Jones could not come to grips with the implications of African aspirations for his educational program, not all of his collaborators were as myopic. Alek Fraser stated categorically that Achimota should not be an imitation of Hampton or Tuskegee, and noted sagaciously that the Jones reports lost some of their relevance because they did not grasp the difference between the political status of the West African and the American Negro. "Hampton and Tuskegee have to train their students for the most meagre of political futures. Achimota will train the future leaders of West Coast."[1] Garfield Williams and Hanns Vischer, the two British members of the East African Commission, were less than wholehearted in their enhtusiasm of Jones' recommendations.[2] Even Oldham recognized that Jones' program was dangerously narrow.

---

[1] Letter, Wilkie to Jones, January 20, 1923, Phelps-Stokes Fund file A-22(3).

[2] Letter, Handley D. Hooper to Jones, August 10, 1922, Edinburgh House Box F-18.

> . . . I cannot help thinking that left to himself he [Jones] would be in danger of educating the African like the American negro. We want something quite different and the experiment can only be made in Africa itself.[3]

The economics of African education escaped Jones just as did its politics. If one trains people to be better farmers, then the communities in which these farmers reside must be related to economic centers. If there is no relation between the two, then it is impossible to exploit the market process that always plays a key part in changing farm methods. In short, improved agricultural training is dysfunctional unless expanded opportunities for market participation are made available, and unless these opportunities can provide more remunerative advantages than the old methods. Jones tended to advocate industrial and agricultural training without making provisions--even theoretically--for expanded opportunities. Rural people do not, as a rule, accept innovation rapidly, and will do so only if they can perceive expanded opportunities, be they financial or psychological. Jones' approach to the unity of the community and its people was probably an approach in the right direction; however, his nineteenth century laissez-faire approach to the problem of expanded markets and opportunities precluded the acceptance of his four Simples, for they existed in a vacuum and were ignored by the Africans who could see no advantage to be derived from them.

---

[1] A. G. Fraser, "The Real Function of the Prince of Wales College, Achimota," Elders West African Review, August, 1931, p. 100.

[2] Letter, G. A. Gollock to Oldham, n.d., but c. September 1, 1924, Edinburgh House Box F-20.

[3] Letter, Oldham to E. F. Spanton, July 3, 1924, Edinburgh House Box D-18.

Despite Jones' irritating habits and a penchant for ignoring diverse opinions, even Hanns Vischer, certainly not one of his greatest admirers, had to admit that Jones had done some excellent work on the East African trip.[1] Vischer noted that Jones did not know much of the African, nor could he discuss matters scientifically. On the other side, however, was the job he had accomplished in Kenya, Uganda, and Tanganyika, where he brought the missionaries and Government together; in Nyasaland where he paved the way for Government cooperation with the missions; and in Northern Rhodesia where he did very good work with the local missionaries and greatly impressed the Governor.[1] In Salisbury, however, he was met by a hostile group as a result of his previous visit and statements, and only managed to exacerbate an already uncomfortable situation by some bits of rather glib humor.[2]

---

[1] Letter, Vischer to Oldham, April 8, 1924 and May 1, 1924, Edinburgh House Box E-18.

Notwithstanding its detractors, the Phelps-Stokes Fund had carved a permanent niche for itself in the field of African education as a result of these first ventures to the Dark Continent. The next fifteen years were to witness an attempt to bring to fruition some of the Fund's ideas concerning education in Africa, and as acknowledged leaders in the field, Jones and the Fund turned their attentions to a series of projects in Liberia and South Africa where, it was hoped, theory could be converted into practice.

---

[1] Letter, Vischer to Oldham, June 12, 1924, Edinburgh House Box E-18.

[2] Ibid. Jones got up before the Missionary Conference and, sensing the hostile atmosphere, announced that he had a message, which was: "'Tis me, 'tis me, 'tis me, Oh Lord, Standing in the need of Prayer." Vischer reported that this was greeted by dead silence, and a moment later the notebooks of the assembled group could be heard to close with a click.

# CHAPTER V

# THE FUND AND A BLACK REPUBLIC

## Early Interest in Liberia

The political climate in Liberia during the 1920's and 1930's was hardly auspicious for an American organization to attempt to strengthen the woefully inadequate educational system. From the early years of the twentieth century Liberia had been threatened internally by a chronic financial situation and externally by menacing overtones from Britain and France. The outbreak of World War I disrupted her foreign trade, and a revolt in 1915 by the coastal Kru people only heightened the fear of British intervention. By 1920 Liberia's financial situation was so precarious that she agreed, albeit reluctantly, to place the collection of revenues and control of virtually all government expenditures in the hands of American officials in return for a $5,000,000 United States Government loan. However, the loan agreement failed to receive United States Senate approval, and Liberia was left on the verge of bankruptcy.[1]

American financial interest in the Republic was renewed several years later when the Firestone Rubber Company entered the country to cultivate and export rubber. Through a subsidiary, the Firestone

---

[1] Raymond L. Buell, Liberia: A Century of Survival (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1942), pp. 24-32.

Company loaned the Liberian Government $5,000,000.[1] Many Liberians felt that the Firestone agreements signalled the death knell of the Republic's independence, and the resulting anti-Americanism, somewhat dormant hitherto, became more manifest just when the Phelps-Stokes Fund embarked on its educational work in the country. And although the interests of the individual members of the Phelps and Stokes families in Liberia had always been altruistic, some people came to feel that this noble ideal was not continued by the officers of the Fund which bore the family names.

The Phelps-Stokes Fund's historical antecedents in Liberia date from the 1830's, when Anson Greene Phelps played an active role in the affairs of the New York State Colonization Society.[2] Education as well as colonization assumed a prominent place among the Society's functions when, on May 19, 1850, the Trustees of Donations for Education in Liberia were incorporated by the Massachusetts' legislature. The corporation was given the power to hold ". . . real and personal estate, . . . the income whereof shall be applied to the promotion of Collegiate Education in Liberia, by the establishment and support of one or more seminaries of learning. . . ."[1] Working in tandem with the Trustees of Donations the New York State Colonization Society established an education fund "as donations and legacies specially earmarked for educational purposes were received."[2]

---

[1] The so-called 'Firestone Concessions,' leasing to the Firestone Plantations Company, a subsidiary of the Firestone Tire and Rubber Company of Akron, Ohio, a million acres of land for ninety-nine years for the production of rubber and other agricultural products, was signed into law by President King on November 18, 1926. This act is reproduced in Charles H. Huberich, The Political and Legislative History of Liberia (New York: Central Books Company, 1947), pp. 1098-1100. Divergent views of the beneficient effects of Firestone's entry into Liberia can be found in Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., The Romance and Drama of the Rubber Industry (Akron, n.p., 1932), pp. 101-120; and Nnamdi Azikiwe, Liberia in World Politics (London: A. H. Stockwell, Ltd., 1934). See also Raymond L. Buell, The Native Problem in Africa, II (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928), 818-852.

[2] Although the Society was organized in Albany, New York on April 9 and 11, 1828, it soon foundered on a spate of opposition, led by William Lloyd Garrison, and had to be reorganized ten years later. Anson G. Phelps was a key figure in this reorganization. See Seifman, "A History of the New York State Colonization Society," pp. 69-125. See pp. 54-55 above.

As a direct result of Phelps' death in 1853 and his legacy of $5000 to the Society and the conditional bequest of $50,000 towards the establishment of a theological department in a Liberian college, a movement to incorporate the Society was initiated, culminating in the grant of a charter in 1855. Among the incorporators was Anson Greene Phelps' son.[3]

In 1856-57, owing to a decrease in the applications for aid to emigrate to Liberia, the Society turned its attention to other matters, most notably Liberian education. During the summer of 1856 the New York Society agreed to appoint an Advisory and Cooperative Committee

---

[1] Gardner Weld Allen, The Trustees of Donations for Education in Liberia: a Story of Philanthropic Endeavor, 1850-1923 (Boston: Thomas Todd Company, 1923), p. 119.

[2] Seifman, "A History of the New York State Colonization Society," pp. 126-127.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 128.

176

to work with the Trustee of Donations in the promotion of the cause of education in Liberia. Anson G. Phelps, Jr., newly elected president of the Society, played a leading role in the drafting of a plan to secure the endowment for professorships in Liberia College, which had been founded in 1851.[1]

The interest of the family in Liberia continued unabated into the twentieth century. Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes informed her nephew that

> Grandfather Phelps left a sum of money to found a college in Liberia, but as he did not name his trustees in his will, it was not legal and the money was divided among his heirs. Mother used her share entirely for Liberia, and Carrie [Caroline] and I always felt that it would be both Grandfather's and Mother's direct wish that we should aid Liberia.[2]

But her idea of assisting Liberia was at least a decade old when she broached the subject with Anson Phelps Stokes.

Her natural ally in this venture, one with whom she had worked in the past--sotte voce to be sure--and in whom she had complete confidence, was Mr. Booker T. Washington. "I very much like your suggestion of a Tuskegee in Liberia . . . ," he wrote. "I believe that through our influence and work at Tuskegee we could develop a school in Liberia that could prove most helpful to the civilization and

---

[1] Seifman, "A History of the New York State Colonization Society," pp. 130-131. The untimely death of Phelps, Jr. in May, 1858, cut short his work for the Society, which he remembered with a legacy of $10,000.

[2] Letter, Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes to Anson Phelps Stokes, January 10, 1919, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-0.

182

Christianization of that part of Africa."[1] Despite this initial enthusiasm Washington--most likely in concert with his trustees--grew less enamoured of any official connection between his institution and its namesake in Liberia once the proposal took more definite shape. Although there would be no legal agreement that Tuskegee be responsible for the school, he assured Miss Stokes that ". . . we would be morally responsible for the conduct of the school, and also responsible for contributing a reasonable sum from year to year toward the expenses of the school. . . ."[2]

Having been assured by the Liberian Secretary of the Treasury that a suitable tract of land containing some 700 acres could be secured for a reasonable sum, Washington negated the importance of sending anyone to Liberia to make preliminary arrangements and suggested that a Tuskegee graduate to head the school be selected and dispatched to Liberia immediately. Once the plan was operative he was reasonably certain that it would be possible to secure an annual grant from the New York State Colonization Society "as I am one of the trustees. . . ."[1] This amount would supplement the $15,000 outright grant, the $1000 for five years, and the $5000 contingency grant that Miss Stokes was willing to provide. By insisting that the latter be matched by officers, teachers, and friends of Tuskegee, Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes sought to ensure that the Liberian concern would be as closely allied to Tuskegee as only financial ties could make possible. Her raison d'etre for the school was simple: ". . . the Bible should be taught and the aim of the school should be to make Christian young men and women who will be good citizens, develop their country, and help others."[2]

---

[1] Letter, Booker T. Washington to Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes, December 3, 1909, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-o. This response was prompted by a letter from Miss Stokes to Washington, November 16, 1909, in which she said, in part: ". . . While I will not at present make a definite promise towards the school until I know more definitely what will be done, it is my wish to help towards starting, if one is not already started, a school that will really be a fine school following Tuskegee's methods . . . thus founding a Tuskegee in Africa so that as the years go by Tuskegee will be a bond of union between the colored people here and in the state of Liberia."

[2] Letter, Washington to Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes, August 5, 1914, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-o.

Washington's death in 1915, coupled with the international difficulties created by the war, brought the project to a temporary halt.[3] But by 1918 interest in the project was revived by the appearance of J. B. Coleman of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He had been sent out "to revive the Cox Memorial Institute at St. Paul River," but had been detained at the College of West Africa in Monrovia for seven years where he had labored

---

[1] Letter, Washington to Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes, August 5, 1914, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-o.

[2] Letter, Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes to Booker T. Washington, September 26, 1914, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-o.

[3] Letter, Robert Russa Moton, Washington's successor at Tuskegee, had informed Miss Stokes that ". . . Liberia just now is cut off from the world because of the European war; but even if it were not there is serious doubt in my own mind as to whether or not we could raise $1000 a year among our officers, teachers, and others, for the Liberian school. Moton to Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes, September 26, 1916, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-o.

"with a view to combining the two schools in a plant similar to Tuskegee. . . ."[1]

Thoroughly imbued with the efficacy of the system of industrial education for the Negro South, Coleman, a former teacher at the Vorhees Industrial School, Denmark, South Carolina, had written some months earlier that "Hampton, Tuskegee and its system of industrial schools in the South are to furnish the leaders for Africa's millions. The time is ripe for a beginning. . . . Africa's own awakening to its needs, and the awakening of the Christian Church to its responsibility for the enlightenment of heathen peoples, emphasize the great need of hastening to the task. . . ."[2] While Coleman was not destined to play a role in the Tuskegee-in-Africa, his letter appears to have been the catalyst which determined Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes to approach her nephew Anson about the project. She suggested that Jones, "who has done such a fine piece of work in preparing that helpful report on Negro education," should undertake a similar survey of educational facilities in Liberia. Her proposal predated by just a few months the Phelps-Stokes Fund trustees' authorization to cooperate for a survey of education in Africa.[3]

---

[1] Letter, Coleman to Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes, December 11, 1918, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-o.

[2] J. F. B. Coleman, "An African Tuskegee," *The Southern Voice*, XV (January, 1918), 2.

[3] Letter, Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes to Anson Phelps Stokes, January 10, 1919, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-o.

180

Jones was very critical of the state of educational development he found in Liberia in 1920. One group in particular, the descendents of those American emigrants in the mid-nineteenth century, he held primarily responsible for the antediluvian state of agricultural, industrial, and commercial development of the country, as well as for the lamentable state of educational development.

> . . . The educational welfare of the people has been left almost entirely to the foreign mission societies. The number of schools made possible by the Americo-Liberians themselves is practically negligible, and the type of education in which they are interested is so exclusively concerned with preparation for clerical pursuits and government service of a literary character as to exclude any effort to prepare the youth to deal with hygienic, agricultural industrial, and social needs of either the Americo-Liberians or the Native masses. After a hundred years of life in Liberia, there are but a negligible number of Americo-Liberians who are successful farmers, mechanics, or professional workers prepared to deal adequately with the resources of their country.[1]

It was precisely this vacuum that led to the formation of a group which would attempt to improve on this grim educational assessment.

## The Advisory Committee on Education in Liberia

In 1923 Thomas S. Donohugh of the Methodist Episcopal Church had arrived in Liberia to organize a Board of Education in the local Methodist Conference there.[2] With him went several copies of Education

---

[1] Jones, Education in Africa, p. 298.

[2] The Board of Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church has refused the author permission to examine materials from this period, evoking the so-called Fifty-year Rule. This is particularly unfortunate because there is probably more material available on educational activities in Liberia during the period under examination in the Methodist archives than in any single repository, save the Phelps-Stokes Fund.

18'

in Africa. The Board requested the assistance of the Phelps-Stokes Fund in finding a supervisor of education along the lines recommended in the report. Upon his return Donohugh convened, on March 11, 1924, a conference of representatives of colonization societies and mission boards interested in Liberia. Represented were the New York State Colonization Society, the Trustees of Donation for Education in Liberia, the American Colonization Society, the International Missionary Council, the Department of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the United Lutheran Board of Foreign Missions, the Methodist Episcopal Board of Foreign Missions, and the Phelps-Stokes Fund.

Dr. E. C. Sage, an Assistant Secretary of the General Education Board and president of the New York State Colonization Society, was elected chairman, and Donohugh secretary. The Phelps-Stokes Fund was represented by Leo A. Roy, Jones being in East Africa at the time.[1] As a result of several previous informal gatherings, Donohugh was able to submit a plan of cooperation which had as its main features: (1) the creation of a joint advisory committee with one representative from each organization, which would handle all questions relating to support; (2) the selection of an educational adviser; and (3) the recognition that the committee would be advisory only and would derive its authority solely from the Boards and Societies for which it acted. Thus was born The Advisory Committee on Education in Liberia.

---

[1] Conference of Representatives of Colonization Societies and Mission Boards Interested in Liberia, Minutes of a Meeting held March 11, 1924, copy at Phelps-Stokes Fund.

The possible scope and function of The Advisory Committee was suggested at the same meeting and included among its tasks: (1) to arrange for a survey of educational work currently being done in Liberia by the several Boards and Societies and by the Liberian Government; and (2) to consider definite proposals which might involve cooperation or more extensive work than any single Board or Society might wish to undertake.[1] As a result of this meeting the sixty-eight year old alliance between the New York State Colonization Society and the Trustees of Donations for Education in Liberia gained not only a much needed impetus but considerable financial support as well. Besides appointing Sage as its permanent representative on The Advisory Committee, the New York State Colonization Society at its meeting on March 27, 1924, pledged an immediate $2000 towards the Committee's work.[2]

The Advisory Committee's first order of business was to secure the services of an Educational Adviser. After two disappointments[3] James L. Sibley of Montgomery, Alabama, was selected to take up his duties on July 1, 1925.[1] Born in Juniper, Georgia, in 1883, and a cousin of General Longstreet of the Confederate Army, Sibley was educated at the University of Georgia. He attended several sessions of the Conference for Education in the South which was held at Athens, Georgia, in 1902. There he met and talked with, among others, Wallace C. Buttrick, William H. Baldwin, and Robert C. Ogden. After several years of teaching in the Philippines, he taught in the State Normal School at Jacksonville, Alabama, and when in 1913 the General Education Board offered to pay the salary of a State Agent for Negro Rural Schools in Alabama, the job was Sibley's. A frequent visitor at Tuskegee, he embraced Booker T. Washington's conception of education as a force for building a rural civilization, and he was an enthusiastic supporter of the Jeanes teachers and the concept of training agricultural teachers to make adaptations of the school program to fit the domestic life of the people. At Tuskegee he met Julius Rosenwald and helped initiate the building of the early Rosenwald schools in Alabama.[2]

---

[1] Conference of Representatives of Colonization Societies and Mission Boards Interested in Liberia, Minutes of a Meeting held March 11, 1924.

[2] The New York State Colonization Papers, Minutes of a Meeting Held March 23, 1924, signed Ambrose G. Todd, Secretary Pro Tem. The American Colonization Society pledged $2000 also; the Methodist Episcopal and Protestant Episcopal Boards and the Phelps-Stokes Fund $1000 each; and the Lutheran Board and the Trustee of Donations $500 each.

[3] The job had been offered initially to George M. Wilcox and subsequently to George E. Carrothers, both of whom had spent some years in the Philippine Islands.

While the members of The Advisory Committee were elated about finding one they felt so qualified to handle the monumental problems of Liberian education, not everyone was so rhapsodic. With his practiced skill, W. E. B. DuBois once again took aim at two of his familiar targets. Charging that an Alabama white man who knew how to "handle Negroes" was being sent to Liberia by Jones and the Phelps-Stokes Fund to take charge of missionary education and social uplift in that land, he lamented that "this is unfortunate. . . . The Phelps-Stokes Fund would not even dare suggest John Hope [Negro president of Atlanta University] as superintendent of Education in Alabama although Hope is in every way better fitted than the present incumbent." Here, he felt, was another example of the insidious policy of Jones and the Fund "to force white leadership on Negroes. . . ." Why, DuBois asked, with the hosts of educated Negroes of unimpeachable character ready to serve in Africa "must an Alabama white man be forced down the throats of the Liberians. . . ?" He concluded by noting that "if Mr. Sibley fails in his work he will slander Liberia. . . . If he succeeds the world will learn that only white men can lead Negroes. In either case Mr. Jones and his Fund will triumph."[1]

---

[1] Sibley's name was suggested by Anson Phelps Stokes. "On a recent visit to Tuskegee I met Mr. J. L. Sibley of Montgomery, Alabama. . . . He is a Southerner with a fine attitude on all race problems." Letter, Stokes to Donohugh, April 13, 1925, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(1).

[2] These details were taken from Jackson Davis, "Biographical Sketch of James L. Sibley," 1929, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1. (Typewritten.)

Not unnaturally Jones felt that this criticism was "unfair and unfortunate" and added that he had feared "from the beginning the radical Negroes would break out this way. . . . Such an outbreak leads me to wonder more and more how much we should consider the agitations of radical Negroes. Dr. Dillard's advice seems wise, to 'let the heathen rage.'"[1] While the polemics flew and the heathens raged, Sibley was en route to Monrovia.

---

[1] W. E. B. DuBois, Editorial, The Crisis, XXXI (January, 1926), 113-114.

Sibley's first order of business was to undertake a survey of the educational work being conducted in Liberia. He began his investigations in January, 1926, and concluded them six months later.[2] Much distressed with the pathetic state of educational development in the Republic, Sibley charged that ". . . most mission work done in Liberia . . . appears to be artificial, superficial, and lacking in contact with the community." Preaching and teaching seemed to have undermined the best in native character and self-respect, and "to have substituted instead a weak imitation of something foreign." He recommended the Penn and Calhoun Schools as good examples of the type of community involvement education needed to foster in Liberia. The great educational panacea could only come about, however, if "the work [is reorganized] upon the lines suggested by the Phelps-Stokes Reports."[1]

---

[1] Letter, Jones to Sage, December 18, 1925, Phelps-Stokes Fund file K-50. Jones was, not surprisingly, the most influential member of The Advisory Committee. In addition to his position as Secretary of the New York State Colonization Society (elected May 3, 1923), the Phelps-Stokes Fund's representative on the Committee (appointed by the Fund's Executive Committee, April 3, 1924), and later the Vice-Chairman of The Advisory Committee (elected May 12, 1925), he was generally recognized, by virtue of Education in Africa and his forthcoming volume on East Africa, as an expert on African educational matters, an expertise which none of the other members of The Advisory Committee could claim. For DuBois, the connections of the Fund and Jones with Liberia were just another example of their attempts to maintain white suzerainty over Negro and African affairs.

[2] Sibley's findings and recommendations are contained in "Education and Missions in Liberia, A Preliminary Survey of the Field for the Information of Board Members," 1926. (Typewritten.) This research was somewhat refined the next year and incorporated in James L. Sibley and D. Westermann, Liberia--Old and New (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., 1928).

Sibley was cognizant of the magnitude of the problems he faced as Educational Adviser. He well understood that in order to be effective the missionary effort must offer the Liberians something superior to what they already possessed. The native must be shown that a new type of family life, based on monogamy, and a system of private ownership of land and the cultivation of the soil by the man and his family would net him more in the long run than what he was doing. None of the missions was doing much for the natives of the interior in the way of agricultural training, and he feared that without a modification of their system of instruction, and the method for selection of workers for the Liberian field, they stood a good chance of repeating their abominable record along the coast. He recommended that the missions should center their work at one or two stations, equip them for reasonable teaching, and for work along medical, industrial, and agricultural lines, as well as for religious instruction.[2]

That this burden was primarily the responsibility of the various mission societies was due to the abstention of the Liberian Government.

---

[1] Letter, Sibley to L. B. Wolf, Secretary of the Board of Missions of the United Lutheran Church, January 23, 1926, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(1).

[2] James L. Sibley, General Letter Number 2, May 26, 1926, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(1).

The Department of Public Instruction had been created only in 1900, a full half-century after the Republic had claimed its independence. In 1926 the Government was spending only $15,000 per annum to maintain some forty elementary schools. There were no government controlled secondary or higher institutions.[1] Sibley did feel, however, that the public authorities were making "a sincere attempt" and that the proper supervision of these elementary schools along the lines used by the Jeanes supervisory teachers might prove a real boon.[2] With this dismal picture to dampen the collective spirits of the New York-based Advisory Committee, Sibley returned to the United States in October, 1926.

Despite his cheerless account, Sibley retained his buoyant optimism about the potential of Liberian education. With the financial backing of the Phelps-Stokes Fund and the New York State Colonization Society, he organized a ten-day conference of Liberian workers at Hampton Institute in February, 1927. He informed the trustees of the New York State Colonization Society that he hoped to take three people with him to Liberia who could help with the work--a man trained in agriculture, a woman specialist in teacher training, and a Jeanes supervisory teacher. As the American Colonization Society had already contributed $3000 for this purpose, he was hopeful that the New York Society would make available a like amount.[1]

---

[1] The four post-primary institutions, Liberia College, the College of West Africa, Cuttington College, and Monrovia College, were under the control of, respectively, the Trustees of Donations for Education in Liberia with substantial assistance from the New York State Colonization Society; the Methodist Episcopal Church; the Episcopal Church; and the African Methodist Church.

[2] Sibley, General Letter Number 2.

Having evolved a definite plan for Liberia, Sibley hastened to share it with Jones:

> My experience in the South and my year's residence in Liberia convince me that adaptations of the work which the General Education Board undertook in the Southern States in connection with home and farm demonstration work are greatly needed in Liberia. The work can be carried over into the schools by means of the Jeanes teachers. . . . It will enable the schools to vitalize the work in relation to home and community.

With the cooperation of James H. Dillard, Jackson Davis, W. T. B. Williams of Tuskegee Institute, and several state agents for Negro education, Sibley organized during the summer of 1927 the Association of Jeanes Teachers for Liberia. The purpose of the Association was to raise $3000 annually for three years for the support of a Jeanes teacher in Liberia. Miss Virginia Randolph, the first Jeanes teacher, agreed to serve as Honorary President.[2] Operating out of the Phelps-Stokes Fund's office, Sibley issued his call to fund a Jeanes teacher who would find her greatest opportunity for service helping to raise the standard of family life among the women and girls of the Liberian

---

[1] The New York State Colonization Papers, Minutes of a Meeting Held February 2, 1927, signed Thomas Jesse Jones, Secretary. At its meeting on June 16, 1927, the Society appropriated $4000 for Sibley's scheme.

[2] Memo from Sibley to Sage, June 5, 1927, copy in Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-2(1).

185

hinterland. He appealed to each of the 300 Jeanes teachers in the South to be responsible for raising "as much as ten or twelve dollars in her home county, among the school children, churches, and other organizations," to enable a teacher "to take the gospel of better homemaking to their less fortunate brothers and sisters in Africa."[1]

The product of these labors was the arrival in Monrovia on November 20, 1928, of Rebecca E. Davis, the initial Jeanes teacher in Liberia. Immediately aware of the immense problems confronting her, she wrote that the successful conclusion of the educational work would entail a long drawn-out process and many years of hard work before results could be seen among the native people.[2] But as her tenure in Liberia lasted only some six months, she would see few results.[3]

Having set in motion the machinery to finance Miss Davis, Sibley re-embarked for Liberia in September, 1927. From London he wrote to Jones that he felt very encouraged over the work accomplished during the year. Convinced that his services, which he likened to those of Jackson Davis in the South, as adviser were much more effective than if he worked full-time on details and methods of conducting schools,

---

[1] Sibley, Circular letter entitled "Association of Jeanes Teachers for Liberia," July 28, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-2(1).

[2] Letter, Rebecca E. Davis to Jeanes Co-Workers in the United States, January 8, 1929, copy in Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-2(4).

[3] Minutes of a Meeting of the Advisory Committee on Education in Liberia, January 7, 1930.

190

he noted that Harold Bare and Susan Mitchell could look after the details of instruction.[1] At the same time he warned Jones that because of inertial tendencies on the parts of the Mission Boards' Secretaries, who "are simply submerged in details of running Asia, Africa, and other parts of the world, I shall have to lean heavily on you, Dr. Stokes, Dr. Dillard, and Mr. Davis."[2]

While in London Sibley had conferred with Lugard, Vischer, and Guggisberg, all of whom expressed enthusiasm about his plans for Liberia. He also spent a day with Liberian President Charles D. B. King, who "seems to be heartily in accord with our suggestions about coordinating the work of the various groups with that of the Government. . . ."[3]

---

[1] Mr. Bare was hired as the agricultural specialist; Miss Mitchell as the teacher-training instructor.

[2] Letter, Sibley to Jones, November 3, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(1). Because of their strategic positions, it was not unnatural for Sibley to turn to these individuals. Jones, in addition to his Phelps-Stokes Fund connection, was Secretary of the New York State Colonization Society and Chairman of The Advisory Committee, having succeeded Sage, who died on October 4, 1927; Dillard was a trustee of the New York State Colonization Society, the Phelps-Stokes Fund and the General Education Board, as well as the President of the Jeanes and Slater Funds; Davis was the New York State Colonization Society's representative on The Advisory Committee, succeeding Sage in that capacity; Stokes, while not a member of either the New York Society or The Advisory Committee at this time, exerted a certain omniscience which made his inclusion of Sibley's list foreordained. Other members of The Advisory Committee were: Donohugh of the Methodist Episcopal Church; Henry L. West of the American Colonization Society; George G. Wolkins of the Trustees of Donations, A. B. Parsons of the Protestant Episcopal Church; and Roy of the Phelps-Stokes Fund.

[3] Letter, Sibley to Jones, October 4, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(1).

Before he left New York, Sibley had drawn up plans for the period 1927-30. These included: (1) cooperation with the Methodist, the Episcopal and the Government groups in rebuilding and reorganizing three colleges for higher education; (2) cooperation with the Government, through the Secretary of Public Instruction, in building up a system of public education by encouraging the establishment of village schools upon a sound basis and by assisting in the matter of proper supervision of country school systems; (3) cooperation with the Firestone interests in developing vocational education and welfare work in those villages on acrage leased to the rubber concern.[1]

The public authorities appeared as enthused about his proposals as did the Educational Adviser. "The Government has given us a very 'large order' [in the reorganization of its public school system] and it is now up to us to make good."[2] For the 1928-29 fiscal year Sibley's budget from The Advisory Committee had risen to $16,500; yet he still felt hard pressed for funds.[1] By virtue of his appointment in February, 1928, as Educational Adviser to the Government--"to help Dr. Payne [the Secretary of Public Instruction] in reorganizing the entire school system"[2]--he hoped to persuade the Liberian legislature to allocate a larger proportion of its expenditures to education. And indeed he had reason for his optimism. "The last legislature doubled the [educational] budget, giving $65,000 for all purposes this year. . . . There is a good disposition to develop local schools in the interior. . . . We have plans formulated for model school houses on our Rosenwald lines, and also compulsory attendance laws . . . in Monrovia and Cape Mount. . . ."[3]

---

[1] "Proposed Plans of James L. Sibley for Next Three Years," June, 1927, copy in Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(1). The Firestone interests were to become closely associated with the work of The Advisory Committee on Education in Liberia and the Booker Washington Agricultural and Industrial Institute, Harvey S. Firestone, Jr. later becoming a trustee of the latter.

[2] Letter, Sibley to Jackson Davis, January 4, 1928, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(1).

The year 1928 was, on the whole, a productive one for the Educational Advisor and his staff, a fact reflected in Sibley's Annual Report to Jones.[4] Susan Mitchell, adviser in teacher-training, and Harold Bare, the agricultural specialist, spent much of their time visiting mission centers in the Republic and advising the teachers regarding their work. The former constructed and conducted a series of arithmetic tests to enable the local teachers to judge the efficiency of their instruction. In the thirty-two schools he visited Bare provided teaching demonstrations and aid in organization. Health, gardening, and agriculture were emphasized, and 5-H clubs, to train for the Head, Hand, Home, Health, and Heart, organized when possible.

---

[1] To the Treasurer of The Advisory Committee, Sibley wrote that he had had to borrow $1000 from the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Monrovia and $750 from other sources to defray expenses. Out of his total budget, $10,200 went for salaries, thus leaving some $6300 for travel, rent, equipment, and other expenses, a wholly inadequate sum. Sibley to Parsons, April 9, 1928, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1. The problems of financing the work became even more acute as it was expanded.

[2] Letter, Sibley to Jones, March 17, 1928, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(1).

[3] Letter, Sibley to Jones, March 17, 1928, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(1).

[4] Letter, Sibley to Jones, January 21, 1929, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1.

Sibley felt that his appointment as Educational Adviser to the Government was particularly gratifying for it indicated "the confidence which they have in the good intentions of The Advisory Committee at home and its staff in the field." With the cooperation of the Department of Public Instruction, a series of Teacher institutes, attended by nearly 85 percent of the teachers in the country, was held in various locations during the year. The Government also appropriated $5,000 towards the expense of publication of a number of textbooks adapted to Liberian and West African conditions. By the close of the year a Primer, First, Second and Third Readers, Arithmetic and Home Geography had been published by Ginn and Company of New York and London.[1] This year also witnessed the inauguration of Educational Outlook, edited by Sibley, a monthly paper devoted to Liberian educational matters.

Although there was still much to be done, Sibley felt that "in some ways the mission work shows improvement over the past year." All the missions would be more successful, he felt, if they met more often and planned their educational programs with greater care and with more regard for the fundamental needs of the people, which "lie along the lines of health, religion, industry, and homemaking, adapted to local requirements."

---

[1] It was George A. Plimpton, president of the company and a long time member of the New York State Colonization Society upon whom Sibley prevailed to interest his firm in this publishing venture.

But undoubtedly the most significant educational event of 1928 was the granting of a charter by the Liberian Legislature on November 29 for the incorporation of the Booker Washington Agricultural and Industrial Institute. Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes' dream of a Tuskegee-in-Africa, of which she was the primary benefactor, had finally come to fruition; unfortunately, she did not live to see her vision fulfilled, having died on December 14, 1927.

## The Booker Washington Agricultural and Industrial Institute

Miss Stokes' idea lay dormant until 1925 when Sibley reopened the question. In July, 1927, he convinced her that what she had almost deemed inconceivable now lay within the realm of possibility. But while she may have been discouraged over the lack of progress following her initial suggestion of the plan to Washington in 1909, she had taken a precaution to insure that her wish would be honored, after her death at least. In 1910 Miss Stokes informed the Tuskegeean and her nephew Anson that she was planning to leave them $50,000 in trust to "carry out my wish and found a school in Liberia, similar to

Tuskegee. . . ."[1]

On July 19, 1927, Sibley, Bishop Mathew W. Clair of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Robert R. Moton of Tuskegee, and Anson Phelps Stokes met at the latter's residence in Washington, D.C. Sibley informed the gathering that Miss Stokes had renewed her offer to grant $15,000 for a Tuskegee-in-Africa if the same amount could be secured from other sources.

The conferees decided that the most expeditious course would be to enlarge the Methodist Episcopal's St. Paul River Industrial Institute, change its name to the Booker Washington Institute, and give the 250 acres together with the buildings and equipment of St. Paul's to the reorganized Institute. On behalf of the Phelps-Stokes Fund Stokes agreed to accept his aunt's gift of $15,000, transferring $5,000 of it to the Methodist Episcopal Church for the purchase of equipment while investing the remainder on behalf of the Institute. He also guaranteed any difference there might be between the annual income of his aunt's special fund and $1,000, so that a total annual income for the Booker Washington Institute of that amount could be counted upon through the Phelps-Stokes Fund.

Moton obligated Tuskegee to pay from time to time the travelling expenses of a graduate or member of Tuskegee's faculty to Liberia for the purpose of having at least one Tuskegee representative on the site of the Institute at all times. In addition, Tuskegee agreed to help secure teachers and other officers "sympathetic with Booker Washington's ideals of education, cooperation, and service," as well as providing an annual scholarship at Tuskegee for at least one competent student selected by the Booker Washington Institute.[1]

---

[1] Letter, Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes to Booker Washington and Anson Phelps Stokes, January 18, 1910, copy in minutes of Meeting of Executive Committee and Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, November 22, 1935. She added that "should such a school as I wish to found be already established in Liberia, and in your judgement you deem it advisable not to establish another school, then the amount I give you can be given to the school already established. . . ."

When Stokes informed his aunt of the meeting she replied that she had "decided to give $25,000 outright instead of $15,000 for school and equipment and $2,000 a year for five years as originally promised. This can be put . . . under the management of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, and $5,000 of this amount can be used for equipment."[2] Since the $25,000 grant was contingent on a similar amount being raised by the Methodist Episcopal Church, Stokes moved quickly to ensure that group's cooperation. His efforts were soon rewarded. Donohugh wrote that ". . . Our special committee has definitely recommended that the Board of Foreign Missions accept the offer of Miss Stokes and to recommend . . . that it agree to provide from $15,000 to $25,000 for this purpose within the next five years."[3]

---

[1] Anson Phelps Stokes, "Tentative Memorandum Regarding the Development in Liberia of an Agricultural and Industrial Institute Modelled on Tuskegee," Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-3.

[2] Letter, Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes to Anson Phelps Stokes, July 30, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-0.

[3] Letter, Thomas S. Donohugh to Stokes, August 10, 1928, Phelps-Stokes Fund file D-8.

197

When Sibley sailed for Monrovia in August, 1927, it looked as if the Booker Washington Industrial and Agricultural Institute was destined to play a vital role in the generation of the Liberian educational structure.

Olivia Egleston Phelps Stokes' death in December threw the Booker Washington Institute developments into a state of temporary limbo. Because she had neglected to include the Institute among her legatees, the matter was taken to court where, after considerable delay, it was declared that her estate should provide the financial backing for the Institute as she had indicated in her last writings. It was April, 1929, before the Phelps-Stokes trustees learned officially that they had received $25,000 from Miss Stokes' estate as well as of the $50,000 fund which had been left to Moton and Stokes.[1]

Upon his return in 1927 Sibley took up the matter of the proposed Institute with President King. He assured Sibley that if another site were chosen and the Institute were organized on a non-denominational basis--i.e., removing it from the control of the Methodist Episcopal Church--he would recommend to the Legislature the allocation of from 600 to 1,000 acres of land coupled with an annual grant of $5,000 for not less than ten years. With these strictures in mind, Sibley and Bare, at the request of the local Advisory Board of the Booker Washington Institute,[1] set out to select an appropriate site. This they found at Kakatown, or Kakata, an area "which offers excellent possibilities for farming and extension work among native villages, as well as for the development of a campus and local group of buildings. . . ."[2]

---

[1] Minutes of the Executive Committee and Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, April 17, 1929. Upon Washington's death in 1915 Miss Stokes had changed her will to stipulate that he should be replaced by Moton. Although the income from the Stokes-Moton Fund was used for Liberian education, it was not until 1935 that this money was transferred to the Phelps-Stokes Fund proper.

The selection of the site was occasion for the first disagreement between Sibley and Jones and was important as a harbinger of the kinds of problems which were to plague the Liberian work. Jones felt that Sibley was acting far too independently and when an attempt was made to restrain the Educational Adviser's exuberance, Sibley's ire rose. "It is rather disconcerting," he wrote

> to find the local Board drawn over the coals [by the New York Advisory Board] for selecting the school site before your representative had arrived. The matter of the site was rather definitely agreed upon at our first meeting, attended by Mr. Donohugh [on his 1928 visit], when we accepted President King's suggestion to move the site to Kakatown. . . . At that time we never knew whether you would send a man out to advise with us. . . . When we did request a man, it never occurred to us that he would be expected to pass upon the site. We wanted him for buildings and general help in organizing the school.[3]

---

[1] Members included: The Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Liberia, Chairman; the Secretary of Public Instruction, President; Sibley, Secretary; the president of the College of West Africa; the president of Liberia; the American Minister to Liberia; the Superintendent of the Lutheran Mission; and the Bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Church.

[2] Letter, Sibley to Jones, January 21, 1929, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1.

[3] Letter, Sibley to Jones, April 12, 1929, Phelps Stokes Fund file S-1(1).

This lack of communication and confusion about procedure, among other things, were to cause the Phelps-Stokes Fund personnel almost unmitigated anguish and despair over the next fifteen years.

Sibley's cultivation of King paid dividents. "The Legislature adjourned before the House granted the Charter, but the President was so interested in the matter that he called the two houses back into extra session and had the charter enacted into law. . . ."[1] The most relevant articles of the Charter provided for the incorporation of the Board of Trustees of the Booker Washington Agricultural and Industrial Institute of Liberia; the granting of 1,000 acres of land near Kakata for the use of the Institute; and the ten year appropriation of $5,000 for the Institute's work.[2] With the charter secured and the site selected, Sibley and Bare began to groom the grounds for the dedication exercises on March 17, 1929.

The Founder's Day Exercises for the Booker Washington Institute were described as "the greatest educational event in the history of the country."[3] On the grounds a large white 'Altar of Industry' had been erected in front of the reviewing stand, where President King presided over the ceremonies. Each of the twelve attending chiefs presented something typifying the resources of the country and the work of the school.

---

[1] Letter, Sibley to Stokes, November 30, 1928, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-3.

[2] An Act Chartering the Booker Washington Agricultural and Industrial Institute, passed and approved November 29, 1928, copy in Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-3.

[3] Sibley, Circular Letter, March 19, 1929, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1.

Desirous of proceeding with all possible haste--owing to the expected departure from office in 1930 of the Institute's most influential friend, President King--Sibley informed Moton that the Institute's local trustees had requested that the Principal of Tuskegee, with the advice of Jones and Stokes, select a man to go to Liberia to advise those in the field as to the layout of the buildings and grounds. To this end R. R. Taylor, Vice-Principal of Tuskegee, arrived in Monrovia on April 20, 1929, remaining some six weeks. After giving his general approval to the undertakings, Taylor, accompanied by Rebecca Davis, the Jeanes teacher, went to Achimota to observe Alek Fraser's work.[1]

Exactly where the money required to run the Institute would come from was uncertain. Only the income of approximately $2,500 from the Stokes-Moton Fund was available, the capital remaining unassailable. Of Miss Stokes' $25,000 bequest, $20,000 was invested and $5,000 was available for immediate purposes. The Methodist Episcopal Board was committed to a $5,000 annual allocation for five years, as was the Liberian Government. With the Phelps-Stokes Fund's annual $1,000 appropriation to round out the finances, Jones estimated that the total operating income for the Booker Washington Institute would amount to no more than $13,500 per annum.[1] At this time neither of them realized that the Liberian Government's allocation would never be made. But these fiscal woes receded temporarily under the impact of a blow which could hardly have come at a more inopportune or unexpected time--Sibley's death from yellow fever on June 28, 1929. His removal at this critical juncture left a void which could never be adequately filled.

---

[1] "Report of R. R. Taylor upon the Booker Washington Agricultural and Industrial Institute at Kakata, Republic of Liberia, October 1929," copy in Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-3.

But Sibley's plans had not been greeted with universal acclaim, even by his friends. His collaborator, D. D. Westermann, questioned the logic of establishing the Booker Washington Institute. While praising the Educational Adviser's work, he wondered if it would not have been wiser to establish schools rather than another college, stating that "what Liberia needs is mass education." Then he gave a clue as to why the Institute had the Government's blessing when he said that "this [mass education] is exactly what the Liberian Government does not want."[2] Sibley himself was aware of the hostile attitude Hanns Vischer, the Secretary of both the British Advisory Committee on Education in Tropical Africa and the International Institute for African Languages and Cultures. Failure to gain the Institute's support worried Sibley, who felt Vischer's attitude resulted from his lack of sympathy with American interest in Liberia as a result of the

---

[1] Letter, Jones to Sibley, December 28, 1928, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-3.

[2] Letter, D. D. Westermann to A. B. Parsons, June 14, 1929, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-4(3).

202

Firestone Concession.[1]

So indignant were the members of The Advisory Committee over the cause of Sibley's death that they took up the matter of yellow fever control both with the Rockefeller Foundation and the State Department, and they voted to send no additional workers to Liberia unless and until a Sanitary Officer was appointed and was on location.[2] But eradication or not, there were workers in the field and plans had to be formulated for them and for the Institute.

Recognizing that a further degree of unity among the interested parties was essential for any progress at this critical period, the Advisory Committee decided to incorporate itself, to add Stokes, Moton, and Harvey S. Firestone, Jr. to its ranks, and to act as the American Board of Trustees of the Booker Washington Institute.[3]

Since Sibley's death Jones had been searching for a suitable replacement. In the interim he suggested that Frank E. Cholerton, a builder, go to Liberia to proceed with construction at the Kakata site. "His position is not yet defined," Jones wrote to Bare, informing him of Cholerton's appointment, "and we are depending to a considerable extent on you and Mr. Cholerton to divide the responsibilities. . . ."[1] The ambiguity surrounding Cholerton's duties led, not surprisingly, to confusion in Liberia. Uncertain about its own course of action owing to Sibley's death, The Advisory Committee transferred its muddled thinking to the field and then could not understand the reasons for the imbroglio and resultant lack of progress there.

---

[1] Letter, Sibley to Stokes, June 1, 1929, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-3. Vischer's own educational views and experiences, especially in Northern Nigeria, make his opposition to the Booker Washington Institute scheme, for any reason, difficult to explain. See Graham, Mission and Government Education in Northern Nigeria, 1900-1919, with Special Reference to the Work of Hanns Vischer, and Perham, Lugard, The Years of Authority 1898-1945, pp. 498-511.

[2] Minutes of a Meeting of The Advisory Committee on Education in Liberia, October 28, 1929.

[3] Minutes of a Meeting of The Advisory Committee on Education in Liberia, October 29, 1929, and September 19, 1930.

Still intent on combining the functions of the The Advisory Committee staff in Liberia with those of the Institute, the Committee redefined its objectives in 1930. The projections called for six staff members: an Educational Adviser; a Jeanes Teacher; a specialist in teacher-training; an agricultural specialist; a specialist in industrial education; and a specialist in Rural Church Service. These individuals would be maintained jointly by The Advisory Committee and the Trustees of the Institute on the basis of the proportion of time devoted to each project. The residential headquarters for the staff would be at the Institute. As the entire Liberian venture was still inadequately funded (a fact which The Advisory Committee recognized but passed over), Jones hoped that the industrial specialist could be borrowed from the Firestone works.[2]

---

[1] Letter, Jones to Bare, November 19, 1929, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-2(2).

[2] Minutes of a Meeting of The Advisory Committee on Education in Liberia, April 11, 1930. The estimated annual income from the two bodies was $22,350. A minimum of $21,500 was earmarked for staff salaries and housing. These figures did not provide for such items as travel to and from Liberia, equipment, or unforseen expenses.

In the meantime Cholerton, who had been appointed Acting Principal of the Institute, was busy. He reported that some eighty boys, ranging in age from twelve to twenty, and from the primary grade to the seventh grade, were working on the alternate day system of work and study. The first four grades emphasized building and agriculture, and after the fourth grade the boys specialized in carpentry, tailoring, trading, and agriculture.[1] But he was not as pleased with the non-academic matters. In plotting the school site (a result of Taylor's visit) the surveyor found that it contained only 601 acres rather than the 1,000 granted. Expenditures were running far ahead of receipts, and he expected the financial situation to become more acute.

By the end of the year, however, events seemed to be on a firmer footing, at least as far as The New York Advisory Committee was concerned. A new Educational Adviser had been secured, Cholerton agreed to remain in charge of the Institute and continue with the building program, and Bare, who had returned home on leave earlier in the year, was planning to return to Liberia to continue his agricultural work.

Sibley's successor was Howard W. Oxley, who had studied Rural Sociology in Iowa before pursuing a varied educational career. Arriving in Liberia in December, 1930, Oxley's enthusiasm waned. "There is nothing left of Sibley's program save the Booker Washington Institute. . . . I have inherited some things from Sibley's regime that are going to be difficult to outgrow. Before his death, he had lost the Government, and you know the Missions did not feel kindly towards him. . . ."[1]

---

[1] Letter, Cholerton to Jones, May 1, 1950, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-2(1).

Nor was The Advisory Committee spared criticism. Charging that it had undertaken "too big a job with the capital in hand," he recommended that all resources be invested in the Institute proper rather than in staff which ". . . galavant all over the country." A strong, solvent Institute could, in addition to its regular work, host teachers' conferences each summer and do extension work. Such a plan would plant the educational work "on solid rock and do away with all the confusion that now exists in the minds of the Committee back home, the local Committee here, and the staff of the Advisory Committee and the Institute."[2]

Oxley was extremely unhappy with his staff. Cholerton should not have been appointed Principal, he asserted, because he did not want school boys but laborers for his building projects. As a result, "the academic work has been practically nil." And although there were some qualified Liberians, Nigerians, and Sierre Leoneans who could possibly give the Institute an academic boost, Oxley was not disposed to hire them. ". . . We must always have an adequate white staff to hold the Institute to a steady course," he asserted. "The efficiency of the Negro is increased many fold under the leadership of a white man. . . ." Although the black man could guide his own destiny someday, "in the earlier stages of development he must be selected, trained, nurtured, coached, and guided."[1] With only two white faces on the Institute site, Oxley argued that the employment of more Africans would be injudicious at this time.

---

[1] Letter, Oxley to L. A. Roy, January 21, 1931, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(4). A. B. Parson wrote to Jones, December 27, 1928, that one of his Board's missionaries in Liberia had commented: "I am more than ever convinced that Sibley's whole outfit is a huge joke. . . ." Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-4(3).

[2] Letter, Oxley to Jones, February 6, 1931, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(4).

It is instructive that in a school stressing agricultural training none of the sixty-one boys enrolled in the Institute in 1931 selected agriculture or farming as their vocational preference. For this dismal record Oxley blamed Bare who, he charged, did not know as much about indigenous gardening, farming, poultry or livestock as most of the native staff.[2]

The academic work of the Institute, modelled on Tuskegee, was limited to three days per week, alternating with a like number of work days. The syllabus for the fifth grade can be taken as an indicator of the academic orientation. At this level the students read from a book, attempting to understand the meaning of words and passages; constructed simple sentences in English; worked up simple fractions and proportions; and studied the outlines of European geography and

---

[1] Letter, Oxley to Jones, March 2, 1931, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(4).

[2] Ibid.

207

its commercial relationship to West Africa. Several hours a week were reserved for obedience and punctuality training, as well as for health and scripture lessons.[1] As the instruction was limited to six hours per day with staff of questionable quality, the benefits derived from the training were doubtful.

Personnel problems continued to plague the fledgling Institute. Oxley, whose grandiose scheme called for a minimum expenditure of $50,000 for buildings alone and another $10,000 for current purposes, convinced Jones that his return to New York to discuss the educational plans with The Advisory Committee was imperative and returned to the United States less than a year after he went to Liberia. "I have laid plans broad and deep," he write, "and we must adopt a unified policy looking forward twenty-five to fifty years. At last the Government is looking to us. . . ."[2] However, this euphoria soon dispersed, despite his meeting with The Advisory Committee at the end of 1931. Shortly after he left London for Monrovia in February, 1932, Oxley disappeared until Jones received the following explanation in May: "Upon arrival at Monrovia February 24, I discovered a very bitter law suit was in progress . . . in which I was wanted as a witness. . . ." Sensing that his usefulness as the Educational Adviser had reached its

---

[1] Letter, Oxley to Jones, March 5, 1931, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-4(4).

[2] Letter, Oxley to Jones, May 28, 1931, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(4).

209

tether, Oxley resigned.[1]

Jones again set out to improve the situation at the Institute. He was, however, attempting amelioration at a single--but potentially important--cog in the Liberian educational system at a time when the future of the Republic as an independent entity was in serious question.

With prodding from the United States State Department, the League of Nations agreed to investigate charges of slavery and forced labor in Liberia. The unanimous report of the three-man International Commission (representing the United States, Liberia, and the League) was placed on President King's desk on September 8, 1930. Three months later he resigned, following by a day the example of his Vice-President, who had been charged with trafficking in forced labor to and from Fernando Po. Edwin Barclay, then Secretary of State, became Acting President. The American government refused to grant Barclay recognition because he could not give assurances regarding certain reforms desired by the State Department.

Early in 1931 Liberia asked the League of Nations for advice and assistance regarding her financial dilemma. Several plans were evolved by the League's Committee, only to be turned down by the Liberian Government. Inextricably bound up in these negotiations were representatives of the Firestone Corporation and their financial advisers. In July, 1932, the Liberian government accepted the League Committee's recommendations; however, the terms of the agreement were so vague as to be ineffectual. This unsatisfactory situation dragged on for several years, mutual recriminations were bandied about, and Firestone's name became anathema in Liberia.[1] The close association between the Firestone group and the Booker Washington Institute was not lost on Liberian officialdom.

---

[1] Letter, Oxley to Jones, May 5, 1932, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(4).

Recognizing that the strained governmental ties between the United States and Liberia were placing its educational work in jeopardy, the Advisory Committee on Education in Liberia petitioned the State Department to manifest ". . . some concrete evidence of the present interest of the American Government in the welfare and future of the Liberian people. . . ."[2]

At the height of this diplomatic furor, it was decided that Henry L. West, President of both the American Colonization Society and the Booker Washington Institute Trustees, should visit Liberia to ascertain the educational climate. His findings were grim. "The thing that strikes me most forcibly . . . concerning Kakata is that experimentation has been costly and in the main unsuccessful." The quality of the teaching staff at the Institute was poor yet expensive.[1]

---

[1] Raymond L. Buell, "Slavery in Liberia," News Bulletin of the Foreign Policy Association, X (January 16, 1931), 1-2; Harvey S. Firestone, "Memorandum on the Liberian Situation," May 10, 1933, copy in Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-2(5); United States Department of State, "Background Concerning the Present Situation in Liberia," December 12, 1933, copy in Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-4(2).

[2] Letter, Jones to Harry L. Stimson, February 24, 1933, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-5.

Unfortunately the Institute's problems were not alleviated by West's visit. In September, 1932, Fred G. Leasure, another Jones appointee, had gone to Kakata as principal of the Institute. His tenure was thirteen months, culminating in yet another surprise resignation. His contribution, however, was not altogether negligible for, in addition to completing some building despite The Advisory Committee's desire to cut back, he did discern several important trends which could have served the Committee well had it heeded his warnings. He recognized that the close relationship with the Firestone Company hurt the Institute since "anything connected with the company is a target for bitter criticism."

More important, however, was his observation "that the Americo-Liberians [do not] want an agricultural and industrial institute . . . for their own children, and just as truly they prefer that the Natives have no education of any kind. . . ." Petty harassment of the Institute (in the form of continual law suits and thievery) was compounded by the personal difficulties Leasure was experiencing with the Secretary of Public Instruction. Because of the embarrassment aroused by the international squabble over her internal affairs, it is not surprising that Leasure sensed, without realizing what it was, the manifestations of a nascent Liberian nationalism. ". . . I've good reason to seriously question the status of any white man now in Liberia. . . . Race feeling runs high of late. . . . Grant that a change comes, those . . . here now will be classified with Firestones as the instruments which caused Liberia's downfall. . . ."[1]

---

[1] H. L West, "Conclusions Regarding Kakata," November, 1932, American Colonization Society Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

The humiliation which the Liberians felt was never adequately appreciated by Jones, Stokes or The Advisory Committee as a body, and this apparent insensitivity was to hamper their efforts on behalf of the Institute in the future. Perhaps it was their paternalistic approach which blinded them to the Liberian realities; transferring as they did the philosophy and means of education employed in the Negro South, they were incapable of understanding that the Liberians prized their independence above all else--even educational progress.

By 1934 the situation at the Institute was critical, notwithstanding a Jones visit there late in 1933. The Phelps-Stokes Fund had invested a great amount of time and energy in the project, apparently to no avail. As one observer put it: "The position at Kakata, as it seems today, is apparently hopeless."[2] But this same observer felt that there was still one card to play.

L. A. Roy's interest in the Liberian project probably dated from his visit there with the Education Commission in 1920, his presence at the organizational meeting of The Advisory Committee during Jones' absence in East Africa in 1924, and his subsequent election as Assistant Treasurer of the Committee. Perhaps his Negro ancestry (a little known fact which neither Roy nor any of the Phelps-Stokes Fund personnel appeared anxious to make public), coupled with his desire to step out of Jones' long shadow, was also a contributing factor. Whatever the reasons, it was Roy who devised a plan, which he termed "our last chance," in 1934. The leading character in the unfolding drama was to be, not surprisingly, Roy himself. He advocated that he go to Kakata, act as superintendent of building construction--Roy was a 1911 graduate of Hampton--and work out a system of accounting and records so that the Institute could have some semblance of routine.[1] He could also oversee the work of Samuel B. Coles, an American Negro missionary from Angola, whom Jones had borrowed recently from the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

---

[1] Letter, Leasure to Jones, May 24, 1933, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(5).

[2] Letter, L. A. Roy to Jones, August 28, 1934, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(7).

A highly-recommended graduate of Talledega College, Coles' successes in Angola made him the appropriate man for supervisor of building construction and industrial training at Kakata. Roy's remark that his presence ". . . would also serve as a balance to any over-intimate association which Mr. Coles might be inclined to develop with the Liberians" is perhaps indicative of the psychological-identification complex which plagued the Phelps-Stokes Fund's Office Secretary.[1]

---

[1] Letter, Roy to Jones, August 28, 1934, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(7).

Notwithstanding opposition from Bare, Robert E. Campbell of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and R. L. Embree of the Methodist Episcopal Church--all of whom were white and members of the local Advisory Board--Coles was sent to Kakata in November, 1934. The fact that he was sent despite the veto of those in the field is yet another indication of the strained relationships between the Advisory Committee in Liberia and that in New York. Roy followed a few weeks later. His initial reactions were not favorable. The student material was not very encouraging; the Local Advisory Committee was non-existent; the sanitary conditions were deplorable; in short, "this place will never be worthy of the Phelps-Stokes connection until [the most rudimentary work is completed]. . . ." But once this work was completed, ". . . nothing can stop this place from being another Achimota or Tuskegee. . . ."[2]

The primary tasks, in Roy's view, were the construction of buildings, development of the natural resources, proper landscaping, and the organization of the industrial education program. While not unmindful of the educational side of the Institute, Roy felt that ". . . books without health, books without food, and books without shelter and protection will all result in a very poor grade of work." Without adequate protection, ". . . any effort at keeping a real school can only be make believe."[1]

---

[1] Letter, Roy to Jones, August 28, 1934, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(7). Roy's problems of identification must have been monumental. He went on to play the role of the classic, patronizing, Uncle Tom when he said: "I fully appreciate the apprehensions the missionaries may have regarding a Negro at Kakata. If he [Coles] fails to win their sympathy and cooperation great damage can be done to all the work in Liberia. If he plays too much into the hands of the Liberians, he will set up Kakata as a recreation center for Monrovia officials. . . ."

[2] Letter, Roy to Jones, December 30, 1934, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(7).

Roy's visit was scheduled for three months; he remained almost nine. During this time even he had to admit that Coles was competent, and early in 1935 the school kiln, under Coles' direction, turned out its first bricks. Coles soon won over his initial critics, and when there was some talk about sending him back to Angola Embree said that this would be a mistake, noting that "[Coles] is a real man, and he is needed at Kakata until someone better qualified arrives. . . ."[2] Coles' record, especially when compared with his predecessors', was impressive. In 1936 he reported to Jones that he had made over 100,000 bricks for the pump house, the power house and the woodwork shop. In addition some thirty-one acres were under cultivation, and a like amount had been prepared.[3] Despite these accomplishments, Jones' ear was attuned more to Coles' detractors than to his advocates, with the result that he was returned to Angola in August, 1936.

---

[1] Letter, Roy to Jones, February 10, 1935 and March 5, 1935, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(7).

[2] Letter, Embree to Jones, February 11, 1936, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(6).

[3] Letter, Coles to Jones, July 29, 1936, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(6).

Roy, who insisted that the physical side of the plant be strengthened before instruction recommence, left after the new principal arrived. Paul Rupel had spent two years with the Church of the Brethren Mission in Northern Nigeria and was the technical man Roy wanted. Rupel remained at the Institute for three years and was by far the most successful headmaster to date. Forced to operate the project on an inadequate budget, he did well to steer the institution over the shoals he did.

Rupel soon found himself bogged down in the multiferous administrative activities involved with the physical construction of the school plant. Nonetheless his report for the 1936 school year did evince signs of progress. Some one hundred boarding pupils and twenty-five day pupils were enrolled from the primer through the eighth grade. All the boys worked half a day and attended class the other half. The pay for the half day's work was credited to the Boarding Department. The older students were divided into the following trade courses: carpentry, masonry, brickmaking, agriculture, and general mechanics. Presumably some form of reading, writing, and arithmetic instruction was provided although no mention is made of it.[1]

The arrival of his brother Claude as Vice-Principal in September, 1936, allowed the principal to devote more of his energies to the strengthening of the academic side of the program than had been possible heretofore. At Kakata Claude Rupel devoted the bulk of his time to construction activities. When his brother left in 1938, Claude Rupel had the dubious honor of succeeding him. The pecuniary difficulties remained, however, and when Rupel asked Jones if a ninth grade should be added to the school the latter agreed just so long as no extra funds were required.[1]

---

[1] Letter, Paul Rupel to Jones, January 4, 1937, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(8).

The nature of the instruction offered also presented problems. Claude Rupel informed Roy that when the boys in the eighth grade were told that the proposed ninth grade would continue along industrial and agricultural lines, "they all left except one. . . . Most of them seem to want to go on to schools where they can get more strictly academic work. . . ."[2] Rupel was also aware that the financial limitations under which the Institute labored complicated an already difficult situation. ". . . The program here is too large for the help and finance which we have. It is difficult for the people at home to realize this. . . ."[3] But perhaps a greater obstacle to progress than the fiscal policy or the nature of the instruction offered was the political milieu in which the Institute operated.

---

[1] Letter, Claude Rupel to Jones, October 25, 1938, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(9).

[2] Letter, Claude Rupel to Roy, May 27, 1939, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(9).

[3] Letter, Claude Rupel to Stokes, February 18, 1939, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(9). Earlier, Embree had written to Jones that "there is altogether too much going on at BWI for one man to supervise adequately. . . . Because of the size of the establishment and the wide program that is being attempted at BWI, you absolutely must keep at least two men in the spot here in Liberia if you are going to get anything like the results you desire. . . ." Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-2(3).

The Institute's political problems dated to Sibley's assiduous courting of President King. His successor, Edwin Barclay, felt that the Booker Washington Institute had been largely his predecessor's creation and that as such it had harbored his, Barclay's, political foes.[1] Nor were the implications of chartering the Institute's Board of Trustees in the United States rather than in Liberia lost on Barclay. There is some reason to believe that the local Advisory Board was merely a sop to convince the Liberians that they really had some say in the running of the Institute's affairs. To complicate matters there was the close identification of the Institute with the Firestone name when the rubber concern was hardly looked on with favor in Liberia during the mid-1930's. Little wonder, then, that the Liberian hierarchy was hardly enamoured of the Institute during the 1930's.

The hostile attitude of Monrovia officialdom towards the Institute was compounded by the alleged enmity of the American Minister, Lester A. Walton. A Negro, Walton had been a long-time friend of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, first as a journalist and later as a staff member of the Commission on Interracial Cooperation, a position obtained largely through the efforts of Moton and Jones. When it became apparent in 1935 that the United States Government was about to renew

---

[1] Letter, B. B. Cofield to Jones, November 11, 1939, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(10).

218

diplomatic relations with Liberia, Walton's name was advanced by The Advisory Committee for consideration as Minister.[1] Stokes used his influence in Washington to good avail;[2] Walton arriving in Monrovia in October of 1935.

The new Minister soon sensed that all was not well at Kakata and attributed much of the trouble to the principal.[3] Walton felt that Rupel was too retiring to project his personality beyond the campus boundaries, a serious shortcoming at a time when the Institute was so lacking in official friends. For Coles Walton had praise, "despite the fact that he usually gives me a headache by his enthusiastic utterances," and felt that he was doing good work under the stabilizing influence of Rupel. But neither Rupel nor Coles was the kind of 'salesman' the Institute needed to sell its project.[4]

For his part Rupel felt that Walton, together with Barclay, was the main obstacle to the Institute's development. He insinuated that, working in collusion with the Monrovia officials, Walton stirred up a considerable amount of anti-white and anti-American sentiment, thereby contributing to the strained relations between the Institute and the Government.[1]

---

[1] Letter, Jones to Stokes, May 25, 1935, Phelps-Stokes Fund file K-26.

[2] Letter, Stokes to William Phillips, Under Secretary of State, May 27, 1935; and Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, to Stokes, June 8, 1935, Phelps-Stokes Fund file K-26.

[3] Letter, Walton to Jones, January 24, 1936, Phelps-Stokes Fund file K-26.

[4] Letter, Walton to Jones, April 5, 1936, Phelps-Stokes Fund file K-26.

At the request of the State Department, Walton prepared a statement detailing the conditions at the Booker Washington Institute.[2] This unsparing report was unappreciated by Jones and The Advisory Committee, who felt that Walton had abandoned them in a moment of need. Noting that relations between the Liberian Government and the Institute were badly strained, Walton stated the reasons for the Government's dissatisfaction as follows: (1) it is felt that the head of the Institute should be a Negro; (2) the Government resents the discrimination in pay of employees based on race; and (3) the educational policy seems to be modelled after the colonial educational policy of West Africa.[3] According to the Minister, the fact that students were compelled to spend more time in work than in the classroom was not acceptable to the Department of Public Instruction. Walton agreed with the Liberian officials, and had so informed The Advisory Committee, that a Negro principal from the United States could do much to mend the strained relations.

Accompanying this statement was a report on the Institute by the

---

[1] Letter, Paul Rupel to Stokes, January 11, 1939, Phelps-Stokes Fund file K-26.

[2] Letter, Wallace Murray, Division of Near Eastern Affairs, to Stokes, January 28, 1939, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-4(3).

[3] Letter, Walton to the Secretary of State, January 7, 1939, copy in Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-4(3).

Liberian Supervisor of Schools.[1] The tone was from from positive. "The living quarters offer poor accommodations for the students. . . . [The dining room] was dirty. . . . One of the water closets is very unsanitary. . . . The one I observed at Booker Washington Institute was not only a menace to health, but it was an insult to education. . . . Teaching load entirely too heavy. More teachers should be employed. . . ."

Copies of the documents were forwarded to Stokes, who noted that the Government's opposition to the Institute resulted from "what we thought, namely, that the Government wants a Negro head, and that it does not like the type of industrial and agricultural training the Institute is providing."[2] While basically agreeing with the Government's position on the former point, he suggested that the Institute did not wish to duplicate the work of the College of West Africa and pointed out that the differing types of education provided by the two institutions were of equal importance. It was a question of both-and rather than either-or.

Jones, obviously piqued by this criticism, assured Walton that the Phelps-Stokes Fund had nothing but "the highest ideals for education in Liberia." Like an aggrieved and misunderstood father he felt "personally perplexed and sad that the lack of cooperation seems to be

---

[1] E. Mills-Scarbrough, "Report of the Supervisor of Schools," July 14, 1938, copy in Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-4(3).

[2] Letter, Stokes to Wallace Murray, February 1, 1939, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-4(3).

221

so evident within the circle of our intimate Liberian friends and even of friends that are both American and Liberian in their precious origins."[1] And to an official at the Department of State Jones confided that "it is my further conviction that our American Minister has unconsciously encouraged the President in this whimsical but really dangerous attitude [toward the Institute]."[2]

The situation was not improved by the selection of R. L. Embree as the Principal of the Institute in 1940. Embree had been in Liberia for a long time, serving as the Principal of the College of West Africa from 1924 to 1936, and as Educational Specialist for the Republic of Liberia from 1936 to 1939. A member of the Local Advisory Committee almost from its inception, Embree was well aware of the problems of Liberian education in general and Kakata in particular: ". . . The Liberians think Kakata a pretty bad mess. . . ."[3]

That Embree's selection was a faux pas was indicated by the remark of a State Department official: "I am somewhat surprised . . . that Mr. Embree should be asked to become principal of the Booker Washington Institute. . . . I wonder whether he would not be handicapped in that position by reason of the fact that his services as

---

[1] Letter, Jones to Walton, August 16, 1939, Phelps-Stokes Fund file K-26.

[2] Letter, Jones to Henry S. Villard, September 8, 1939, American Colonization Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

[3] Letter, Embree to Donohugh, January 21, 1935, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-4(2).

Educational Advisor were deliberately terminated by the Liberian Government, presumably *because he was not a Negro*."[1]

Villard's incredulity was not misplaced. The intensity with which Liberian officialdom viewed the entire question--and which those in New York obviously did not comprehend--was summed up by President Edwin Barclay, who wrote to Stokes in quite concise terms that Liberians felt that their American friends who desired to aid them "appear to look upon Liberia as they would upon a Negro community in the southern United States. . . ." Of the Institute, he said,

> The Kakata school would . . . be much more effective if organized and conducted along the lines of Tuskegee itself, with a qualified Negro at the head. I have heard it said that a qualified Negro cannot be found in the United States who could be entrusted with this work. This, if true, would be a very sad commentary upon the work done at Hampton and Tuskegee. . . . Because I feel that the Liberian point of view in respect of this school has been ignored, I have taken very little interest in [it]. . . . As long as there is at the head of the Institute a man of alien blood who assumes a contemptuous attitude towards Liberia and Liberians, so long will the school's effectiveness be limited or negated.[2]

Whether Barclay's statements were an accurate reflection of events and attitudes is hardly relevant; what is germane is the fact that he and his colleagues had been led to believe that they were accurate and no actions had yet dispelled their illusions, if such they were.

There were other contributing factors to the lack of success at

---

[1] Letter, Villard to West, October 25, 1939, American Colonization Society Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Italics added.

[2] Letter, Barclay to Stokes, July 8, 1943, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-2(1).

223

Kakata. G. W. Harley, a long-time medical missionary at Ganta, pointed to several: "Since I came to Liberia, no less than thirteen changes have been made in the principalship of Booker Washington Institute--eleven individuals have served in this capacity--not counting Mr. Roy and yourself, or Mr. West, all of whom have been on the spot." He charged that many of the principals complained bitterly of Roy's "muddling way of doing business." Roy's exercising of executive functions ". . . handicapped the progress of the work at Booker Washington Institute. . . ."[1] Walton amplified on these points when he noted that the Kakata work was hampered by the lack of administrative ability demonstrated by those selected from time to time to head the Institute. This, of course, was aggravated by the fact that "the school was persona non grata with President Barclay."[2]

But the grim picture brightened slightly when, in 1944, Walton reported that for the first time he felt that the Institute had begun to justify the expenditure of time, effort, and money on it.[3] After sixteen years of physical labor the Tuskegee-in-Africa was finally coming into its own. By 1948 instruction was provided through the tenth grade, and the enrollment had expanded to 185 pupils. The operating budget for 1949 ~~was~~ $34,379, or more than double what it had been during the 1930's.

---

[1] Letter, Harley to Jones, March 13, 1943, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-2(1).

[2] Letter, Walton to Stokes, June 1, 1944, Phelps-Stokes Fund file K-26.

[3] Letter, Walton to Jones, February 1, 1944, Phelps-Stokes Fund file K-26.

On July 5, 1948, the trustees of The Advisory Committee on Education in Liberia voted to disband their board and to turn over to the Booker Washington Institute all assets.[1] On April 26, 1950, an amendment to the Charter of the Institute was passed by the New York Trustees, creating a Board of Trustees in Liberia to supervise and manage the affairs of the Institute. On September 14, 1951, the New York Board of Trustees, cognizant that the Institute could no longer function as an independent entity, resolved that the Institute be integrated into the University of Liberia for the purpose of pursuing the study of mechanical arts, agriculture and associated subjects.[2] The Booker Washington Agricultural and Industrial Institute was dissolved officially on December 31, 1953, when it was incorporated into the University of Liberia.

From the perspective of some thirty-five years it is perhaps easier to pinpoint the causes for the problem confronting the Booker Washington Institute than it was for those immediately involved. Among these could be numbered the attempt to run the project on an inadequate budget, a plethora of under-qualified personnel, and the lack of communication and confusion about goal objectives between the

---

[1] Minutes of a Meeting of The Advisory Committee on Education in Liberia, July 5, 1948.

[2] Minutes of a Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Booker Washington Agricultural and Industrial Institute, Inc., September 14, 1951.

New York and Liberian Advisory Committees. More basic than any of these, perhaps, was the failure to properly survey the land--politically as well as physically--before rushing ahead with the project. Sibley, anxious to move ahead while the sympathetic King was still in office, was partly responsible for this, as were Jones and The New York Advisory Committee, which gave him the tacit green light.

What could have been accomplished had those connected with the project heeded the warning signals and attuned their actions to coincide with the Liberian political realities? Early in the 1930's the New York Advisory Committee was aware of the political difficulties faced by the Institute, and yet it never sent out anyone who could make peace with the Government. Why, one must also ask, when the political situation demanded it for effective action, did the New York Advisory Committee not send a Negro to head the Institute? Or even to act as Vice-Principal? Can Stokes' reply to Barclay in 1943, that a qualified black man could not be found, be accepted at face value, or was this another example of the paternalistic attitude of The Advisory Committee towards Liberia?

Barclay's charge that some of Liberia's American friends looked on her as they would upon a Southern Negro community was perhaps more accurate than Stokes imagined.[1] Oxley's attitude towards Liberians, or rather towards Africans in general, was contemptuous, as mentioned above. Paul Rupel, who felt that "when dealing with primitive people force still has its place," was an improvement on Oxley, but still somewhat patronizing. The white members of the Local Advisory Committee had attempted to block the appointment of a Negro, apparently on no other grounds than the fact that he was a Negro. And in the Phelps-Stokes Fund office a Negro seeking to hide his racial origins laid plans to go to Kakata in order to keep watch on the Negro who the Local Advisory Committee did not want.

---

[1] However, there is some evidence to suggest that Barclay was not the easiest person with whom to work. See, for example, Buell, Liberia: A Century of Survival, 1847-1947, p. 9 and passim.

This lack of political sensitivity to the Liberian realities was a marked characteristic of The Advisory Committee's actions and, whether it involved the employment of a Negro principal or the Committee's close ties with the Firestone interests, acted as a negative influence on the Committee's educational work. Nor did the type of education offered help the Institute over the political shoals. Vocational training, coupled with very strong Christian overtones, was not in step with the wishes of Liberian policy makers. Of the Christian emphasis there can be little doubt. Paul Rupel commented on it in the following terms: ". . . the Missionary spirit of the staff is excellent. Everyone has a spirit of sacrifice and helpfulness for the good of the Institute. We have not asked the staff members to sign contracts, because I have often felt that with Christian people and in a Christian institution, written contracts

227

ought not to be necessary."[1] While this assertion calls Rupel's degree of sophistication into question, his strong religious sentiments, a direct reflection of those who hired him, can hardly be doubted.

As early as 1933 Fred Leasure had questioned the enthusiasm of the Liberian Government for an industrial and agricultural institute. Rupel remarked that the greatest tragedy of the Institute was that ". . . We are doing the very thing we came to Liberia not to do--taking the boys away from the farm instead of back to the soil."[2] And yet, doggedly, the curriculum continued to lean heavily towards the vocational. Those in New York could not appreciate that they were dealing with a sovereign nation whose wishes would have to be listened to, if not always heeded. Vocational education as provided at Kakata, regardless of its intrinsic merits or demerits, was not a priority with the Government; yet the Institute's trustees continued to push it.

From 1928 to 1945 the Phelps-Stokes Fund administered $114,846 for The Advisory Committee and from 1932 to 1945 $309,639 for the trustees of the Booker Washington Institute.[3] For all this money and eighteen years of effort the results were disappointing, especially if

---

[1] Paul Rupel, "Booker Washington Institute Principal's Report for Three Years Ending June 30, 1938," p. 3, Phelps-Stokes Fund file S-1(8).

[2] Ibid., p. 6.

[3] Anson Phelps Stokes, Progress in Negro Status, p. 134.

228

compared with another pioneer institution in African education, Achimota.[1]

Administratively maladroit, tapping a succession of either incompetent or politically insensitive principals, Jones and The Advisory Committee must be held largely accountable for this lack of accomplishment despite the fact that the Liberian Government did little to make their task easier. But, then, there was much that The Advisory Committee could have done to win the Government's much-needed support.

On balance, we can conclude that, despite the final product which was turned over to the University of Liberia in 1953, the Booker Washington Agricultural and Industrial Institute was not a successful undertaking for the Phelps-Stokes Fund, especially if it is noted that during the 1930's and 1940's it occupied fully one-third of Jones' and Roy's time, as they attempted to run the Institute from the Fund's offices.

Disclaimers and good intentions notwithstanding, the evidence indicates that Jones, Roy, and those in the field were trying to work for the Liberians without working with them. Perhaps the Americo-Liberians were for a number of reasons, difficult to work with during this period; however, there is scant evidence that a very diligent attempt was made by those concerned in New York to follow a course towards reconciliation. Barclay's estimate of the attitude of some of

---

[1] See Wraith, Guggisberg; and Williams, Achimota: The Early Years, 1924-1938.

Liberia's American friends--patronizing, contemptuous, superior--and the failure of Jones and The Advisory Committee to discuss this attitude is instructive. Negro education in the South had been planned largely by a group of interested whites; there was little consultation with the blacks for whom the educational system was designed. The Booker Washington Agricultural and Industrial Institute was planned by whites and brought to fruition after only token consultation with the blacks concerned. The Liberian Institute was modelled after Tuskegee, it was controlled by foreign philanthropists and clergymen who felt that they knew what the Liberians needed more than did the Liberians themselves. One wonders if in addition to transferring the methods of education employed in the Negro South, Jones and his colleagues were not transferring some traditionally American attitudes towards Negroes to Liberia as well. If this be the case, the work of the Phelps-Stokes Fund in South Africa, the country to which we now turn, will provide an interesting juxtaposition.

# CHAPTER VI

# THE FUND AND SOUTH AFRICA

## First Contacts

The visit of the African Education Commission in 1921 was the initial contact between the Phelps-Stokes Fund and South Africa, a country which, with Liberia, was to become the financial and geographical focus of the Fund's African educational and interracial work until 1945.[1] As in Liberia, the Fund's interests in South Africa were personal and, to a greater extent, professional. The former stemmed from the fact that the grandfather of Mrs. Anson Phelps Stokes was Daniel Lindley, the first minister of the Voortrekkers and an early missionary among the Zulu.[2] The professional interest derived from the fact that many connected with the Fund viewed South Africa as a microcosm of the United States, replete with its problems of racial antagonisms, 'backward' peoples, and inadequate educational facilities. The experience and expertise which had been gained by the Fund's personnel from studying and grappling with these problems in the United States dictated that this professionalism be transferred to the Union.

At the time of Jones' 1921 visit South Africa was governed by the internationally-oriented Smuts and his South African Party. Three years later a general election was held and the Nationalist Party, with Hertzog as its leader, came to power. As one observer said, "it was 1924 that made it finally clear that Afrikaner Nationalism had become the greatest political power in the land."[1] This nationalism signalled the initiation of a more repressive policy towards the African than had been in evidence heretofore. The representatives of the Phelps-Stokes Fund geared their actions and words accordingly. If the Fund was guilty of some indiscretions in Liberia which hampered its work there, its South African work was distinguished by a sense of propriety and tact which was a model of diplomatic finesse.

---

[1] To 1945 the trustees allocated approximately $50,000 to the Fund's South African work in direct grants. Anson Phelps Stokes, Twenty Year Report of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1911-1931, p. 112, and Negro Status, pp. 174-175.

[2] See Edwin W. Smith, The Life and Times of Daniel Lindley 1801-1880 (London: The Epworth Press, 1949).

The realities in South Africa allowed of no alternate course. Because it suited local conditions so well, it is likely that one of Stokes' initial recommendations for the Fund's educational work--that the cooperation of the best white citizens of the South is of prime importance in solving the problem of Negro education--was incorporated into the South African work. The Fund's participation in the field of interracial work in the United States was to find its parallel in the Union also. In fact, it was probably in this field more than in the strictly educational sphere that the Fund enjoyed its greatest success in South Africa. This was due, in large measure, to the energies of

---

[1] Alan Paton, South African Tragedy (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 84.

232

four men: Jones, Stokes, J. D. Rheinallt Jones, and Charles T. Loram.

Loram was born of English parents in Pietermaritzburg in 1879. A disciple of Maurice Evans,[1] he graduated from Cambridge and Columbia University before being appointed the Chief Inspector of Native Education in Natal and a member of the Commission on Native Affairs. Smuts assigned him to accompany Jones and the Education Commission throughout their tour of the Union in 1921. Here began a twenty-year association with the Phelps-Stokes Fund which culminated in Loram's election as a trustee of the Fund in 1939. Jones was impressed even before they met. "His splendid book, Native Education in South Africa, is undoubtedly the best summary on Native education in any part of Africa, and probably one of the best descriptions of educational conditions in any part of the world. . . . Dr. Loram is especially interested in the adaptation of education to the special needs of the Natives."[2]

Loram's educational philosophy was remarkably similar to that of Jones. Industrial and agricultural education, adapted to local conditions, was at its core. "The courses of study should take account of the peculiar experiences of the Natives. . . . From the beginning the

---

[1] The ideological orientation of Evans can be found in his Black and White in the Southern States, A Study of the Race Problem in the United States from a South African Point of View (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1915).

[2] Jones, "Diary of the African Education Commission," p. 195. So impressed was Jones with the book's contents that he forgot the correct title, which was The Education of the South African Native (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1917).

233

education given should be meaningful to the Natives, and to this end should lead up to the future occupations open to them."[1]

In 1923 Loram was offered the Secretaryship of the British Advisory Committee on Education in Tropical Africa at a salary of £1500.[2] However, as his eye was set on £2000, Jones volunteered to intervene with the Carnegie Corporation of New York to ascertain if the Corporation would guarantee the difference. Jones was "especially concerned to make it possible for Loram to accept the Secretaryship . . . because he has an unusual appreciation of American methods of education."[3] The Corporation balked, and Loram remained in South Africa. The next year he was appointed the Fund's representative in the Union.

On his 1921 visit with the Education Commission Jones had been impressed with the striking parallelism between the racial and educational problems in what he liked to call "the two U.S.A.'s," the Union and America. In the educational sphere he emphasized his four Simples and the principle of adaptation. "It is to be hoped that in the future campaigns for sound education in South Africa the advocacy of an adopted curriculum will not be so much along the lines of white and black as upon the lines of economic, hygienic, and social gatherings."[1]

---

[1] Loram, The Education of the South African Native, p. 225.

[2] Letters, Oldham to Sir Herbert Read, Assistant Undersecretary of State for the Colonies, September 19, 1923, October 29, 1923, Edinburgh House Box 219.

[3] Letter, Jones to F. P. Keppel, November 7, 1923, Phelps-Stokes Fund file at Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Not surprisingly, those institutions with strong vocational emphases, e.g., Tsolo Agricultural School, Marianhill Institute, Amanzimtoti Institute, and Inanda Seminary, were accorded high praise by Jones.[2] Of all the institutions for Africans Jones found Lovedale, the product of the labors of the Scottish missionary James Stewart, the most impressive. Despite the fact that it was often referred to as the Hampton of Africa, Jones noted important, disappointing, differences between Lovedale and Hampton. One of these was the very limited instruction in gardening, hygiene, and handiwork related to simple needs, as well as the slight relationship of the school to the community. More distressing was the fact that the students were not taught an adequate sense of their responsibilities to the communities in which they were to work.[3]

The one institution for higher education for Africans was the South African Native College at Fort Hare. The work of the College was based on the requirements of the University of South Africa which, Jones noted, "has courses of a non-practical type. . . ." He considered the difficult course of study at Fort Hare unsuitable for

---

[1] Jones, "Diary of the African Education Commission," p. 196.

[2] Jones, Education in Africa, pp. 208-212.

[3] Jones, "Diary of the African Education Commission," pp. 240-247. A discussion of the work at Lovedale can be found in Robert H. Sheperd, Lovedale, South Africa (Lovedale: The Lovedale Press, 1940).

Native students because of its literary orientation.[1]

In the sphere of race relations Jones, Loram reported, ". . . pointed out to the Natives that they owed a great deal to the white man who conquered their land," and cautioned that only interracial cooperation, as undertaken in the southern United States, rather than discord, could help elevate the status of the South African native.[2]

Jones' comments on John L. Dube and his Ohlange Institute are interesting. While it is doubtful that he was aware of the complex of relationships which linked Dube with Chilembwe and the 1915 Nyasaland rising,[3] Jones noted in the diary, but omitted in the published report, that he "felt that the European authorities in Natal were wise in attempting to remain on friendly terms with him." This after noting gratuitously that there had been unavoidable friction at the Institute because a native principal had attempted to have Europeans working under him. Did Jones feel that friction between black and white was unavoidable because the former, and not the latter, was in a position of leadership?

---

[1] Jones, "Diary of the African Education Commission," p. 248.

[2] Ibid., p. 242. Parts of the South African section were written by Loram.

[3] See George Shepperson and Thomas Price, Independent African (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1958), pp. 91-92. Loram has some interesting comments on Dube's work at Ohlange and its potential for African leadership. See Loram to Phillip Kerr (Secretary, Rhodes Trust, London), November 15, 1925, Edinburgh House Box H-15.

## Two Projects

A decade after this initial trip Jones was to return to South Africa as a Visitor of the Carnegie Corporation. The next year Anson Phelps Stokes made a similar trip under the same aegis. But before discussing the ramifications of these journeys, let us examine the role of the Phelps-Stokes Fund in the development of two specific undertakings in South Africa.

It was on the 1921 trip that Jones and Aggrey enjoyed such success speaking to meetings of the various Native Reform Associations, especially in Natal, which had been founded on lines similar to the local interracial commissions in the United States and which attempted to educate the white South African about the Africans in his midst. Two types of meetings were held--one a committee meeting at which political views were aired and communication made with Government officials, and the other a meeting at which prominent speakers, European or African, addressed the public.[1] By 1926 these Associations had been renamed the Federated Joint Councils and Welfare Societies, and were to be the immediate precussor of a much larger experiment in interracial relations in South Africa.

As a result of an European-Bantu Conference held in Cape Town in 1926, a strong sentiment developed in favor of creating a permanent organization to foster the work of the various Joint Councils in South

---

[1] Jones, "Diary of the African Education Commission," pp. 224-225. See also Edwin W. Smith, Aggrey of Africa, pp. 164-184.

Africa. At this time Loram was the Phelps-Stokes Fund's representative in South Africa and was to become, as a result of the 1927 visit to the Union by Frederick P. Keppel and James Betram, the representative of the Carnegie Corporation of New York as well.[1] When Rheinallt Jones, a professor at the University of the Witswatersrand and the prime mover in the scheme,[2] approached Loram about the possibility of securing financial support from the Phelps-Stokes Fund and the Carnegie Corporation, he (Loram) took the position that, inasmuch as the Joint Councils were politically involved, it would be improper and impolitic for foreign bodies to support such an organization. Loram was, however, impressed with the need for advice and stimulus to the Joint Councils on their non-political activities, and also with the need to foster in the universities and elsewhere an interest in the Native question generally. He felt that an opportunity should be created for Rheinallt Jones to devote his full energies to the task of improving race relations in the Union. Consequently, Loram suggested the formation of a non-political body to which American foundations could contribute with propriety.[1]

---

[1] The Keppel-Bertram trip resulted in an allocation of $500,000 over a five-year period by the Carnegie trustees for African work, a great deal of which was earmarked for South Africa. See the forthcoming Teachers College, Columbia University, doctoral dissertation, "The Role of the Carnegie Corporation of New York in African Education, 1925-1960," by Richard D. Heyman.

[2] For an outline of the career of J. D. Rheinallt Jones, and particularly his role in the South African Institute of Race Relations, see Edgar H. Brookes, *R. J.: John David Rheinallt Jones, in Appreciation of His Life and Work* (Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations, 1953).

In 1927 the Phelps-Stokes Fund made its initial appropriation of $2000 towards the work of the South African Joint Councils and an Adviser on Race Relations.[2] In 1928 the Carnegie Corporation voted $3750 for five years for Welfare Work among Non-Europeans, with the understanding that Loram would be the final arbiter as to the exact allocation of the money. Later that year Loram informed Rheinallt Jones that it would be advisable to form a committee to administer any funds provided by the Phelps-Stokes Fund or the Carnegie Corporation until such time as the Joint Councils were sufficiently organized to undertake the work themselves. He further recommended that, lest the significance of 'joint' in the Councils' name be negated, "we must have at least one Native on such a Committee."[3]

The potential political danger from American grants was very much on Loram's mind, and he warned the New York Jones that in order "to keep yourselves entirely safe I suggest that you expressly exclude political activity from the uses to which your grants could be put."[4]

---

[1] Letter, F. P. Keppel to Patrick Duncan, December 20, 1932, South African Institute of Race Relations file, Carnegie Corporation of New York. Duncan was a Member of Parliament, Minister of Education, and Treasurer of the South African Carnegie Board of Trustees.

[2] Minutes of the Executive Committee and the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, June 6, 1927. The trustees voted this sum for three years, with the understanding that it would be reduced to $1000 for two years if Loram so recommended.

[3] Letter, Loram to Rheinallt Jones, December 27, 1928, Phelps-Stokes Fund file, Carnegie Corporation of New York.

[4] Letter, Loram to Thomas Jesse Jones, December 27, 1928, Phelps-Stokes Fund file, Carnegie Corporation of New York.

239

He cautioned Keppel that the Joint Councils were not popular even with the English-speaking South Africans, and that "the Dutch hate them and would do much to destroy them. If you and the Phelps-Stokes Fund use your money to pay [Rheinallt] Jones' salary and he organizes these Councils which then become political, you will be blamed by the masses of whites here and possibly your other work will suffer."[1]

In May, 1929, a meeting was held at the Johannesburg home of Reverend Ray E. Phillips of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Among those present, besides Loram, Rheinallt Jones, and the host, were: Professor J. du Plessis of Stellenbosch University; Howard Pim, a Johannesburg accountant; Professor Edgar H. Brookes of Pretoria University; D. D. T. Jabavu, lecturer at the South African Native College, Fort Hare; T. W. Mackenzie, editor of the Bloemfontein Friend; and J. H. Nicholson, an attorney and ex-mayor of Durban. After discussing the best use to be made of the monies from the Phelps-Stokes Fund and the Carnegie Corporation, as well as the establishment of a central council for the Joint Council movement, they created the South African Committee on Race Relations and elected Loram as Chairman, Pim as Treasurer, and Rheinallt Jones as Secretary and Adviser of Race Relations. The name was subsequently changed to the South

---

[1] Letter, Loram to Keppel, February 8, 1929, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-1.

240

African Institute of Race Relations.[1]

The Committee agreed that Rheinallt Jones should take up his position at the beginning of 1930; however, as the Carnegie Visitors' Committee in South Africa, of which Loram was chairman, had appointed Jones the recipient of its 1930 grant to visit the United States, it was agreed that he should undertake the trip and study interracial movements in America. This Carnegie grant was supplemented by $500 from the Phelps-Stokes Fund, which undertook the responsibility for planning Rheinallt Jones' American itinerary. Accompanied by his wife, Rheinallt Jones arrived in New York early in 1930. His six week trip included stops at Howard, Hampton, the Penn School, Atlanta University, Tuskegee, Fisk, and the Meharry Medical School. He also discussed interracial work with Thomas J. Woofter and Howard Odum at the University of North Carolina, Will Alexander and R. Eleazer of the Interracial Commission in Atlanta, and Alfred Stern of the Rosenwald Fund in Chicago.

The South African Institute of Race Relations drafted a new constitution in 1932, redefining its functions. To his namesake, Rheinallt Jones wrote[2] that the Institute initiated action but did not

---

[1] Minutes of a Meeting of a Committee appointed to deal with the grant from the Phelps-Stokes Fund for Interracial Work in South Africa, and that of the Carnegie Corporation for General Native Betterment, May 9, 1929, South African Institute of Race Relations file, Carnegie Corporation of New York.

[2] Letter, Rheinallt Jones to Thomas Jesse Jones, May 10, 1932, Phelps-Stokes Fund file N-14(2).

241

undertake detailed administrative responsibility except in special cases. "The Institute endeavors to inspire, initiate, and coordinate . . ." and, at the same time, the Institute "tries to avoid doing other peoples' work while being ready to give special help and advice in cases of need. . . ." More specifically the functions of the Institute could be classified in five areas:

1. To assist in the formation of Joint Councils and other groups that may help to educate public opinion on racial questions;
2. To encourage existing social organizations which confine themselves to European work to undertake welfare work among non-Europeans;
3. To act for groups (e.g., Joint Councils, Missionary Societies) in representations to Government departments;
4. To initiate investigations by individuals and groups and, where necessary, to undertake such investigations;
5. To secure publication of information and its dissemination.

During these early days the Institute was having serious financial problems. Stokes, in South Africa as a Carnegie Visitor in 1932, "was shocked to know that the Institute was funded almost entirely from three sources--viz., £750 from the Carnegie Corporation of New York; £400 from the Phelps-Stokes Fund; and £200 from the Johannesburg Council of Education per annum."[1] All concerned felt it imperative for the success of the Institute, and the closely related work of the Joint Councils, that it should be supported mainly from within the

---

[1] Letter, Stokes to Keppel, September 15, 1932, Stokes Papers, Yale University.

242

Union rather than from without. Rheinallt Jones, pointing out that for the initial three years of its existence he had vetoed any organized publicity for fear of political repercussions, felt that the time was ripe for the Institute to undertake a special campaign, relying upon those friends both within and outside the Joint Councils to respond to appeals.

Consequently, when Edgar Brookes proposed that he leave his position at the University of Pretoria and act as a fund raiser for six months, his offer was accepted with the proviso that the Fund and the Corporation, which would underwrite his salary for this period, would not be obligated to continue this appropriation past the six months. Brookes subsequently reported that the Institute had set out to raise £25,000 for the Endowment Fund, and £2500 in annual subscriptions; his statement on the fund-raising campaign revealed that £1453 had been contributed towards the former, and £1379 towards the latter.[1] Although the amount subscribed towards the Endowment Fund was disappointingly small this first year, the value of the Campaign was measured not only in financial results achieved, but also in the interest aroused.

Political considerations were also beginning to impinge on the Institute's activities. Founded by liberals with the avowed task of gathering and disseminating objective information about all racial affairs, the Institute's personnel believed in a common South African society and regarded segregation as both impossible and unjust. 5 To the Afrikaner Nationalists--epitomized by Malan, Pirow, Roos, and Verwoerd--this was anathema. Jan Hofmeyr, the one political figure who possibly had the power and the inclination to protect the Institute from the buffeting ideological winds, refused to commit himself on its behalf.

---

[1] "Report of the Campaign Organiser on the Six Months Campaign, July 1-December 31, 1932," copy in Phelps-Stokes Fund file N-14. (Typewritten.)

Hofmeyr, an old friend of Rheinallt Jones and Brookes, was seen by many as the only hope for the survival of South African liberalism. The man who could, with apparent impunity, attend the Bantu-European Student Christian Conference at Fort Hare Native College in 1930 could not bring himself to support the liberal Institute of Race Relations. Because of his refusal South African liberalism and the Institute suffered a grievous setback.[1] One can only speculate about the course of South African politics had Hofmeyr accepted the Carnegie Visitors' Grant to visit the United States in 1930.

Despite the hostility and suspicion with which most of those associated with the Institute were faced, Rheinallt Jones took solace from the fact that the Phelps-Stokes Fund had faced a somewhat analogous situation in the American South and had managed, with patience and poise as its crutches, to overcome much of the vitriol directed at

---

[1] A full discussion of Hofmeyr's mercurial career and the course of South African politics in which he was so involved can be found in Paton, South African Tragedy.

24

it.[1] But this stoicism notwithstanding, it was becoming increasingly obvious that the Institute would have to take its stand as an organization in which persons of different shades of opinion (as well as shades of color) could discuss the issues of the day. And at this juncture, the Adviser pointed out, a great many people, fearful of social or political repercussions, would be afraid to identify themselves with the Institute.[2]

In direct proportion to the rise of Nationalist strength, the attacks on the Institute increased, both in numbers and in stringency. Typical of these was a report which charged that, while the Institute was not a secret political society, the activities of the Adviser were by no means limited to establishing branches in the various towns. On the contrary, wherever he went, Joint Councils, opposed to the national native policy, sprang up in his wake. The most insidious feature of the work, however, was the fact that these gatherings, which brought black and white together on an equal social basis, often degenerated from "nice little gatherings into political meetings, at which governmental policy was criticized."[3] Rheinallt Jones noted the ludicrous assertion that "the Institute is supported from a secret fund of £1,000,000 for the purposes of advocating miscegenation."[1]

---

[1] Letter, Rheinallt Jones to Thomas Jesse Jones, January 12, 1934, Phelps-Stokes Fund file N-14(2).

[2] Letter, Rheinallt Jones to Thomas Jesse Jones, November 18, 1936, Phelps-Stokes Fund file N-14(2).

[3] "Well Done," Die Vaterland (Bloemfontein), January 22, 1935.

After maintaining their annual appropriation of $2000, coupled with an additional $500 for travel, for six years, the Phelps-Stokes Fund began to reduce its aid. In 1934 $1350, and $225 for travel, was appropriated; by 1936 the net figure had dropped to $200. The Carnegie Corporation, with its much greater resources, appropriated up to 1939 some $10,500 to the Institute, after the expirary of its initial five year grant. Despite these decreased appropriations, it would be no exaggeration to say that the Institute owed its existence to the financial largess of the Fund and the Corporation, without whose initial support and interest the venture would have been, most assuredly, still born. Indeed, Rheinallt Jones felt that the speaking engagements of Aggrey and Thomas Jesse Jones in 1921 provided the impetus for the Institute's subsequent creation.[2]

Loram's suggestion in 1927 that the Fund finance, or help to finance, a lectureship on interracial problems, with the idea that race relations was a subject needing maximum airing in South Africa, was taken up immediately by Stokes. On behalf of the trustees, he informed the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cape Town that if the University could raise £1000 in South Africa, the Phelps-Stokes Fund would match this amount.[1] Loram, acting as intermediary, stated that while the University was very interested in the question of the lectureship, there was a strong desire to make the project a bigger thing than was envisioned initially. "There was a strong and unanimous feeling that a capital sum of £5000, which would yield interest about £500 every two years would be the minimum amount necessary."[2] If the Fund would agree to increase its contribution to £2500, the University officials anticipated no difficulty in providing a like amount.

---

[1] Letter, Rheinallt Jones to Thomas Jesse Jones, September 18, 1936, Phelps-Stokes Fund file N-14(2).

[2] Letter, Rheinallt Jones to Thomas Jesse Jones, September 17, 1928, Phelps-Stokes Fund file N-14(2).

When the Fund's trustees balked at increasing their grant, Stokes was authorized to approach the Carnegie Corporation to ascertain if it would supplement the Fund's proposed grant. Not surprisingly, as Bertram and Keppel were just preparing their own report and recommendations for the Corporation's African work, the request was refused. Toward the close of the following year, the Fund's trustees instructed Loram to tell the University that its original offer of £1000 was the maximum available.[3] The first series of lectures, entitled "The Education of the African Native," was delivered by Loram in March, 1931, and the second, entitled "The Colour Problems of South Africa," by Edgar Brooks in 1933.

---

[1] Letter, Stokes to Sir Carruthers Beattie, September 8, 1927, Stokes Papers, Yale University.

[2] Loram to Stokes, October 29, 1927, Stokes Papers, Yale University.

[3] Minutes of the Executive Committee and the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, November 21, 1928.

247

At the suggestion of Alfred Hoernle, the Chairman of the Institute of Race Relations, who contacted both the Vice-Chancellor and Stokes, it was agreed that the lectures could, and should, be repeated at other institutions throughout South Africa where appropriate arrangement could be made.[1] Hoernle had been impressed by what Stokes had told him about the Fund's fellowships for the study of "the Negro problem" at the universities of Georgia and Virginia and mentioned that it would be a great boon if the Institute of Race Relations, with outside help, could establish at least one such fellowship. Stokes ignored this oblique proposition.

It was agreed that the lectures would be published in book form by the University at the expense of the endowment fund. One-half of any profit was to be paid to the lecturer and one-half credited to the endowment fund. The lecturer was to be nominated by a committee comprised of the Principal and two other representatives of the University; the Minister of Native Affairs; a representative of the Fund; a representative of the Government of Southern Rhodesia; the High Commissioner for the Protectorates; and the President of the Christian Council of South Africa.

While the establishment of this lectureship was certainly one way to bring the so-called "native problem" into public focus, the fact that it reached such a small constituency was indicative of the apathy

---

[1] Letters, Hoernle to Stokes, April 15, 1932; Stokes to Beattie, June 30, 1933; and Beattie to Stokes, July 25 1933, Phelps-Stokes Fund file N-14.

248

and more prevalent prejudice which faced all movements connected with interracial relations in the Union.[1] There is some evidence that those working in the field of interracial relations in South Africa, as well as Jones and Stokes, seriously underestimated the depth of this racial antagonism. Their continual equation of American racial problems with those of South Africa illustrated a most simplistic approach to the realities of South African history, a history of which they seemed singularly ignorant.

## Visits in the 1930's

Jones' previous experiences in South Africa ensured that he was not about to make inflammatory remarks regarding the race question when he arrived in Cape Town as a Carnegie Visitor in 1931. "I am not an extremist in the study of race relations," he was quoted as saying.[2] Nor was he. While advocating Booker T. Washington's precepts on economic, social, and political questions as being in the best interests of the black South Africans, Jones could, at the same time, assuage the more powerful white constituency. "If the whites make the best possible use of their opportunities, they will be able to continue their society successfully, and development of the native should not endanger that success."[1] While his proponents might insist that he was only temporizing, Jones' well-received remarks have a certain ring of *baasskap* or *apartheid* about them.

---

[1] Sir Carruthers Beattie wrote to Stokes, July 25, 1933, Phelps-Stokes Fund file N-14, of "the excellent attendance, an average of about 150 at each lecture."

[2] The Rand Daily Mail (Johannesburg), May 4, 1931.

Jones avoided the real issue of racial discrimination by disclaiming the notion that an outsider could tell South Africans how to treat their problems. Immersing himself in familiar sociological platitudes, he called for a study of the country and the people as the first requirement for solving the race problem.[2] He held the conviction that the ultimate solution of interracial problems lay more in sound education than in legislation. Relegating justice to a subordinate role, Jones drew an analogy from America where, he said, "we have depended too exclusively on law. The ultimate solution of all our problems is bound up with real education, which develops body, mind, and soul." Playing to his audience, he decried ". . . the hypercritical attitude of certain groups in America and Great Britain who . . . should try to understand the difficulties here and seek to help in finding solutions instead of criticising so severely."[3] Having declared education more important than justice in his scheme for African development and having assuaged the fears of white South Africa regarding that development, Jones once again moved through the social and academic whirl of South African officialdom.

---

[1] *The Rand Daily Mail* (Johannesburg), May 4, 1931.

[2] *Natal Adviser* (Bloemfontein), April 17, 1931.

[3] *The Argus* (Cape Town), June 17, 1931.

Jones demonstrated a remarkable lack of prescience regarding the development of South Africa. Perhaps this was due to his insistence on the close analogies between South Africa and the United States. As late as 1937 he still held the belief that ". . . the two U.S.A.'s, The Union of South Africa and the United States of America, are remarkably parallel in social conditions and educational policies."[1] Eventually, the United States would place justice (at least in the legislative if not in the moral realm) before education on its hierarchical scale of values; the world still waits on the other U.S.A. But Jones' comments on the Dutch Reformed Church call into question not only his prescience but his political insight as well. "I am inclined to think," he wrote in 1927, "that the Dutch Reformed Church is one of the greatest factors in improving native relations with whites in South Africa. The very conservatism of the Church gives it a hold on Dutch opinion that can ultimately be made of real value in forward movements. . . . The Dutch Church in South Africa holds very much the same position as the Church in the South held fifteen years ago. . . ."[2]

Jones managed to gloss over the injustices in South Africa, albeit not very convincingly. A great admirer of Smuts, Jones accepted the General's view that the advance of the African was possible only through the stimulus and support of the more advanced, i.e., white, civilizations of Europe. After all, "American experience strongly supports the advantages to the colored people of contact with the white people. . . ."[1] Jones could not share Oldham's "rather drastic condemnation of South Africa," and chided his friend for allowing the difficulties of the South African situation to obscure from him the great advantages which white South Africa had provided her black brethren, especially in education. On Smuts' view that there was no inherent or inevitable clash of interests between black and white in South Africa, Jones and Oldham disagreed.[2]

---

[1] Letter, Jones to Jackson Davis, April 16, 1937, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-3.

[2] Letter, Jones to Bertram, September 9, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-1.

Jones' advocacy of a specific type of training for the South African natives assumed they lived and worked in a near vacuum. Oldham observed a more fundamental problem, one with obvious political ramifications. While agreeing that agricultural training must be a part of any general scheme for improvement, he carried this to its logical conclusion, viz., that agricultural education did no good for the African who could not secure land.[3] Jones either did not, or would not, see this. He felt that Oldham saw only part of the picture and that "he failed to recognize the potentialities of Smuts' progressive leadership and the vitality of South Africa. . . ."[1]

---

[1] Letter, Jones to Oldham, January 17, 1930, Phelps-Stokes Fund file L-1.

[2] See J. H. Oldham, White and Black in South Africa: A Critical Examination of the Rhodes Lectures of General Smuts (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1930), pp. 20-21.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

Early in 1930, when Smuts was in the United States, Stokes arranged a two-hour conference at Howard University between the South African and a number of Americans prominent in the field of race relations.[2] This meeting took place less than two weeks after Smuts, in a speech in New York City, had declared that "the Negro is the most patient of all animals, next to the ass."[3] Noting afterwards that he had followed Smuts' career and his pronouncements on the Negro with some interest, Walter White wrote that Smuts did "not take into consideration the feelings and ambitions of the natives." Of equal importance was Smuts' woeful ignorance "of the fact that there has been a marked change in the psychology of the Negro himself." Whether one regarded it with indifference, approval, or alarm, there was, in White's opinion, no more important fact at the time than the new militancy on the part of the Negro.[4] Surely Jones could not, after all his exposure and research, suffer from the same myopia.

---

[1] Letter, Jones to Stokes, September 24, 1930, Stokes Papers, Yale University.

[2] Among those present were: Stokes, Moton, Jones, Will Alexander, John Hope of Atlanta University, Walter White of the NAACP, Mordecai Johnson and Alain Locke of Howard University, Jackson Davis, and James H. Dillard.

[3] Rayford W. Logan, "The American Negro's View of Africa," in Africa Seen by American Negroes, ed. by Alioune Diop (Paris: Presence Africaine, 1958), p. 221. When Moton of Tuskegee remonstrated, Smuts declared that his comment really showed his admiration for Negroes!

[4] Letter, White to Stokes, January 16, 1930, Phelps-Stokes Fund file K-42.

253

As Chairman of the Carnegie Visitors' Committee, Loram informed Keppel that the Committee was most anxious to have Stokes--whose "Fund's Jeanes Schools and Educational Adaptations have settled Africa's educational policy for Natives"--visit the Union.[1] Accompanied by his wife and daughter, Stokes arrived at Cape Town in August, 1932, and remained some seven weeks in South Africa.[2]

Following Jones' itinerary to a great extent, Stokes spent much of his time visiting educational and kindred institutions and delivering lectures, particularly on the progress of the American Negro. He too disclaimed any intention of trying to tell South Africa what she should do with "her amazingly difficult Native problem"; instead, he merely explained some of America's successes and failures and pointed out certain principles of education and cooperation which, if adapted to local conditions, might have some value.[3]

In his report to the Carnegie Corporation he elucidated a number of special investment opportunities for American philanthropy. Several of these coincided with the work already undertaken by the Phelps-Stokes Fund or the Carnegie Corporation in Africa. They included:

---

[1] Letter, Loram to Keppel, April 19, 1930, C. T. Loram file, Carnegie Corporation of New York.

[2] His experiences and recommendations are recorded in Report of Reverend Anson Phelps Stokes on Education, Native Welfare, and Race Relations in East and South Africa (New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1934).

[3] Letter, Stokes to Jones, July 12, 1932, Phelps-Stokes Fund file A-1(3).

aid to movements for interracial cooperation; research into Native languages and cultures; library development; aid to strategic Native institutions; development of medical work; and the development of University extension work.[1] Stokes voiced only two disappointments about the trip--that he did not visit Bloemfontein, and that Loram was not in South Africa to accompany his party. The year before Loram had left South Africa for a position at Yale University.

Much of Loram's time in South Africa had been spent furthering the interests of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, the Carnegie Corporation, and the Institute of Race Relations. In 1928 the Natal authorities reminded him that, as his salary was being paid for his services as Chief Inspector of Education, it was time to return to his post or resign. In a joint letter to Stokes and Keppel he asked to be considered as their full-time representative in South Africa, at a salary of $10,000 per annum. But neither the Fund nor the Corporation felt the need for a full-time representative, especially when their respective works could be carried out for a small honorarium, and Loram, suggesting that he would also accept a position in the United States dealing with "Negroes and other peoples of 'retarded cultures'" returned to Natal.[2]

Loram felt that his official position was forcing him away from

---

[1] Report of the Reverend Anson Phelps Stokes, pp. 50-55.

[2] Letter, Loram to Keppel and Stokes, May 29, 1928, C. T. Loram file, Carnegie Corporation of New York.

255

working for the Africans. Consequently, he informed Jones that he was looking for a new position and his first preference was for a useful job in Native Affairs, e.g., the Superintendent General of Native Education for the Union. The Principalship of Hampton was next on the list.[1] Despite the fact that Loram was being considered for the Hampton post, Jones favored the retention of the Acting Principal until the summer of 1931, at which time Loram might be reconsidered.[2]

In 1930, however, Loram's name was advanced by Keppel and Stokes for a professorship in the Department of Education at Yale University, and Stokes did not appreciate Loram's quibbling about the salary.[3]

Until his death in 1940 Loram was a familiar figure in the Fund's offices and at conferences concerned with Negro education and interracial work. So peripatetic was he, in fact, that Stokes felt compelled to advise him that a professor in a graduate department of a major American university was expected not only to teach and to attend meetings but to produce some serious scholarship as well.[4]

In addition to its financial and moral contributions towards the

---

[1] Letter, Loram to Jones, October 6, 1929, C. T. Loram file, Carnegie Corporation of New York.

[2] Letter, Jones to Moton, November 13, 1929, Phelps-Stokes Fund file A-22(3).

[3] Letter, James R. Angell, President of Yale, to Keppel, June 4, 1930, and Keppel to Angell, June 5, 1930, C. T. Loram file, Carnegie Corporation of New York. Stokes to Angell, June 10, 1930, Stokes Papers, Yale University.

[4] Letter, Stokes to Loram, January 15, 1936, Stokes Papers, Yale University. Loram was elected a trustee of the Fund on April 19, 1939. Minutes of the Executive Committee and the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund.

Institute of Race Relations and the influence its personnel--Jones, Stokes, Loram--exerted towards the concept of vocational education in the Union, the Phelps-Stokes Fund also granted money for other South African projects. Most prominent among these were: the support given Max Yergan and his work for the International Young Mens' Christian Association; the grants to Father Bernard Huss for agricultural work at and around Marianhill Institute; the $1000 voted, on Stokes' recommendation, for the purchase of books on race relations and the American Negro for the University of Cape Town library; and the recurrent grant for the Jeanes school at Kambini, Portuguese East Africa, which was administered from South Africa.

That the Fund would conduct its work in South Africa through the established political order, which happened to be white, was never questioned. Jones, Stokes, and Loram assiduously courted the white establishment, a liaison which enabled the Fund to participate in the politically and socially sensitive issue of race relations. The canvassing of African opinion was carried out largely through Africans who had made the grade in the white man's world, e.g., D. D. T. Jabavu of the South African Native College. Aggrey had been able to elicit considerable response from the Africans with whom he had come into contact, but after his death the link was never reforged. The work of John L. Dube, one of the few Africans who labored successfully with Jones' concepts and methods in the black rather than the white milieu, was never considered worthy of support by the Fund, probably because he was considered to be too independent.

The beneficial effects for interracial understanding of the Fund's involvement in the Institute of Race Relations were great. So, also, were those of the lectureship established at the University of Cape Town. Despite these positive achievements, there is evidence that Jones believed that the black South African was to play a subordinate role to the ruling whites indefinitely. His speeches in the Union, especially in 1931, confirm this. Interracial cooperation, as evidenced by the Institute of Race Relations, was an estimable goal, just so long as there were assurances that whites would be the dominant partner in the coalition. Jones felt that "South Africa is destined to become more and more the determinant of all Africa . . . ," more especially because of the "splendid types of whites . . . there."[1]

Nor did Loram view matters differently. He believed that South Africa was, and should remain, a white man's country. Cooperation with the black African was perfectly acceptable; however, this collaboration in no way implied equalitarianism.[2] Loram chastised Jabavu--over a petty incident--for criticizing those Europeans to whom "[he] owes everything including his present important position."[3] Implicit in this, of course, was the belief that an African should be

---

[1] Jones, Education in Africa, p. 179.

[2] Letter, Loram to Joan Loram, September 27, 1930, C. T. Loram file, Carnegie Corporation of New York; and letter, Loram to Jones, August 30, 1926, Phelps-Stokes Fund file N-14(2).

[3] Letter, Loram to Jones, June 26, 1932, Phelps-Stokes Fund file N-14(1).

258

forever beholden to the Europeans who were good enough to 'make' the African what he had become. Loram felt that this ingratitude stemmed largely from the fact that the African had received an education which made him think he was the equal of Europeans. Adapted education, of the Jones-Loram variety, would preclude this erroneous impression.

The Phelps-Stokes Fund was very successful in working with the authorities in South Africa. Why did Jones and the Fund's personnel not enjoy a comparable degree of success in their dealings with Liberian officialdom? It would appear that on the West Coast they paid little attention to the hopes and aspirations of the Liberians themselves, while in South Africa they were extremely mindful of the wishes of the white ruling clique. Was this because they felt that the black man in Liberia was incapable of conducting his own affairs, and success could only be achieved through white leadership? This white leadership was, of course, already present in South Africa.

The Negro in the Southern United States was being educated within a caste system with a strong emphasis on vocational training. Jones and the Phelps-Stokes Fund did their part to perpetuate this trend. In South Africa, similar educational principles were advocated, and the question must be asked if the intention of the Union officials was analogous to that of their counterparts in the Southern United States. One observer noted that the only road to racial peace in South Africa, as it had been in the United States, was to educate "the

Native along lines adapted to his true career as a son of the soil."[1] Jones' educational advocacy--aided and abetted by Loram's similar concepts and strategic position--with its emphasis on the Simples and vocational training, seemed tailor-made for the South African situation, stressing, as it did, white hegemony.

---

[1] P. W. Wilson, "America Discovers South Africa," The World's Work, L (September, 1925), 547.

260

# CHAPTER VII

# COLLABORATION FOR EDUCATION IN AFRICA

## Toward a Unified Policy

Liberia and South Africa represented special attempts at implementation of two of the Phelps-Stokes Fund's policies--the one an effort to institutionalize the concept of adapted education, modelled after Tuskegee; the other a venture at interracial cooperation, patterned after movements in the Southern United States. As early as 1924, however, attempts were undertaken to codify those educational dictums espoused by the two African Education Commissions, and it was with the help of Oldham and the International Missionary Council that these principles became official policy for many missionary societies working in tropical Africa.

Jones arrived in England from the second African educational tour at the end of August, 1924. On September 8, a conference on Christian Missions in Tropical Africa was convened at High Leigh, a suburb of London, largely on Oldham's initiative. The Conference came into existence because of the need for consultation on the part of the Christian forces working in Africa, as well as for the need to gain a view of conditions in the Continent as a whole. Having just returned from an extensive tour of the continent, it was felt that the members of the Phelps-Stokes Commission could provide this overview. No less important was the need for the missionary societies to evolve a

261

definite educational policy if they hoped to maintain their leadership in African education in the face of growing Government interest, i.e., the British Advisory Committee.[1]

Jones' role at High Leigh was central. He reiterated his objectives of education, stressed the importance of religion as permeating the whole of the school work, and drew attention to the failure of much missionary work in neglecting to place the proper emphasis on health, agriculture, and industrial skill. Aggrey supplemented this by noting the primacy of religion in the native mind and recognizing the value of indigenous institutions and adapting, rather than destroying, them in order to achieve the objects desired.

Lugard agreed with Jones that Government should accept as an aim the development of Christian character, an emphasis on religion which Nigeria's ex-governor had hitherto opposed.[2] Rivers-Smith from Tanganyika spoke of the need to keep the African on the land and make him a fit and strong servant of the community through the formation of habits of industry. Mrs. Arthur Wilkie from the Gold Coast echoed Jones' sentiments about the importance of the African home and the vital role women should play in better ordering it. Strong emphasis was laid on the necessity of getting teachers to accept the program outlined by the Phelps-Stokes Commissions. It was agreed that teacher training institutions should be in reach of small village communities; large towns should not be chosen because they were rarely in touch with the real life of the people.

---

[1] Confidential notes from the discussion of the High Leigh Africa Conference, Edinburgh House, Box 216.

[2] Perham, Lugard, The Years of Authority, 1898-1945, pp. 494-496, disucsses Lugard's antipathy towards the idea of a Christian education and his attempts to have education in Nigeria rest on a moral, rather than a religious, foundation.

Jones' memorandum, "An Educational Policy for African Colonies"--hardly differentiated from his recommendations in the two African Education Commission reports--formed the basis for discussion at High Leigh, and the delegates resolved, without endorsing its every detail or its particular order of emphasis, their entire agreement with the memorandum's main conclusions. The Conference further recommended that all the boards represented should transmit Dr. Jones' proposals to their missionaries working in Africa, and to urge their consideration as a basis of a general educational system in Africa.[1] Oldham felt that the resolutions at High Leigh, coupled with the subsequent issuance of Education in East Africa, could play a key role in determining the direction of African educational policy at the Colonial Office, and he strongly urged Anson Phelps Stokes that Jones remain in London in order to expedite the completion of the report.[2]

---

[1] Confidential notes from the discussion of the High Leigh Africa Conference, Edinburgh House, Box 216. The delegates were an impressive group. They represented the Church Missionary Society, the Baptist Missionary Society, the United Free Church of Scotland, the London Missionary Society, the Universities' Mission to Central Africa, only to mention several of the British societies. The North American societies were also represented. Among the visitors were Aggrey, Biss of the Kenya Education Department, Dougall, Fraser, Jones, Lugard, Rivers-Smith, and Vischer. The International Missionary had a full complement.

[2] Letter, Oldham to Stokes, April 8, 1924, Edinburgh House, Box 216.

263

Within several months of the High Leigh Conference plans were being formulated to carry the codification of African educational policy one step further, as well as to bring the continent more into public focus. At a meeting of the International Missionary Council in January, 1925, in Atlantic City, the advisability of convening a special conference to consider African education was discussed. The objects of the proposed conference were outlined in London in March, and a month later Jones was designated a member of the Program Committee.[1] For the topic to be entitled "Education of the People of Africa" it was decided to use the Phelps-Stokes reports and the 1925 British Advisory Committee White Paper as the basis for discussion.[2] The Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund considered the proposed meeting at Le Zoute, Belgium, of such importance that they allocated $8,000--from a $35,000 grant they had just received from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund--towards the expenses of the Conference.[3]

The Phelps-Stokes Fund's point of view was well-represented by American delegates--to whom an entire evening session was allocated so that the American experience in Negro education could be made available for the Conference. John Hope, the President of Atlanta University, was the most conspicuous among the black American delegates. He was joined by Isaac Fisher, a Travelling Research Fellow in Race Relations, who had been closely aligned with the Fund, and Max Yergan, a Negro Y.M.C.A. worker in South Africa. Moton of Tuskegee had hoped to come, but was prevented from doing so by ill-health. Jackson Davis of the General Education Board; James H. Dillard of the Jeanes Fund; E. C. Sage of the General Education Board and the New York State Colonization Society; James L. Sibley, Phelps-Stokes Fund-sponsored Educational Adviser to Liberia; Anson Phelps Stokes; and Charlotte Thorn, the principal of the Calhoun Colored School, were among the white advocates of the Fund's policies. Conspicuous by their absence were such critics as Woodson, DuBois, and Leys.

---

[1] The objects of the Conference included: (1) the education of those who attended it; (2) the attainment of a clearer view of missionary objectives and the best use to be made of present resources; and (3) the awakening of a new interest in Africa and a new sympathy with its peoples among Christians at home. Edinburgh House Box 217.

[2] Meeting at Edinburgh House, June 5, 1925, Edinburgh House Box 217.

[3] Meeting of the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, May 28, 1926.

As at High Leigh, Jones' role at Le Zoute was central. The Conference adopted his conception of education for life and declared that "the curriculum of all types of schools should be drawn up with complete awareness of the life of the community."[1] The Four Simples should be the major determinant of education given in the schools. But some of the delegates felt that Jones' philosophy did not lay sufficient emphasis on religion, and consequently a synthesis was achieved whereby religion was placed at the forefront. Education was no longer to be regarded as 'book-learning'--its aim was not the masterings of books and the passing of examinations, but the elevation of the tone and character of the community in which the school was located.[1] So that which could not be achieved in practice in the colonies at least found formal expression among the delegates at Le Zoute.

---

[1] Edwin W. Smith, The Christian Mission in Africa, A Study Based on the Proceedings of the International Conference at Le Zoute, Belgium, September 14 to 21, 1926 (London: The International Missionary Council, 1926), p. 62.

The Conference also solemnly blessed the union between the educational methods of the Negro South and those of black Africa and, consequently, it was a success not only in its own terms but a vindication of Phelps-Stokes Fund policy as well. Jones' influence was perhaps best illustrated for posterity by the fact that the official report of the Le Zoute Conference was dedicated "to those who laid the trail," and included such luminaries as Vasco da Gama, Wilberforce, Crowther, Livingstone, Slessor, Kitchner, Lugard--and Thomas Jesse Jones.[2] As with the High Leigh resolutions, those at Le Zoute were transmitted to the various missionary conferences in Africa with the understanding that, except in instances where it proved impossible, steps should be taken to give effect to the resolutions.[3]

If the conferences at High Leigh in 1924 and Le Zoute in 1926 marked the ratification of the Phelps-Stokes' recommendations for

---

[1] Smith, The Christian Mission in Africa, p. 63.

[2] *Ibid.*, frontpiece.

[3] Articles relevant to the discussions at Le Zoute were published as a supplement in the July, 1926 issue of the International Review of Missions and are entitled "The Christian Mission in Africa," pp. 323-611.

266

education in Africa, it was the International Missionary Council's Jerusalem Conference in 1928, the successor to the 1910 Edinburgh Conference, which was responsible for giving those recommendations an added impetus.

One of the topics at the Jerusalem Conference was "The Christian Mission in Relation to Rural Problems," and one of the main speakers was Thomas Jesse Jones,[1] who felt that the essential to the success of the Conference was that those in attendance be led to understand and accept his educational philosophy.[2] A tangible result of this meeting was the organization in 1930 of the Agricultural Missions Foundation, a body dedicated to making the problems of rural missions its primary concern and

> to aiding selected persons, institutions, and agencies in any part of the world which are in any way related to the missionary enterprise and in a position effectively to improve agricultural and country life. . . .[3]

Among the members of the Board of Directors were John R. Mott, Chairman of the International Missionary Council; Thomas Donohugh of the Methodist Episcopal Church; Robert Russa Moton of Tuskegee; and Jones.

---

[1] Records of the Proceedings of the various panels at Jerusalem can be found in The Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council, March 24-April 8, 1928 (New York: International Missionary Council, 1928). See Basil Mathews, Roads to the City of God; a World Outlook from Jerusalem (London: Edinburgh House Press, 1928) for a summary of the Conference.

[2] Letter, Jones to Oldham, June 17, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file L-1.

[3] Brochure entitled Agricultural Missions Foundation (n.p., n.d.), p. 4.

It was through this organization that Jones sought to train that elusive sine qua non of African education, the Christian agriculturalist, who would stay on the land and shun the urban centers. The Foundation was a large recipient of Phelps-Stokes Fund largess for a fifteen year period after its organization[1] and Jones and Oldham used their influence to secure some $50,000 from the Carnegie Corporation for the Agricultural Missions Foundations between 1932 and 1935.[2]

The Foundation would consider financial requests from missions to assist in the establishment of rural development units, which included the following services: rural health and hygiene, training of supervisory teachers, agricultural instruction, organization of boys' and girls' agricultural and homemaking clubs, recreational instruction, and adult agricultural extension work.[3]

The director of the Foundation, John Reisner, a long-time missionary in the Far East, travelled to England in 1933 to present his ideas to a group of colonial officials, educators, and missionaries. Both the speaker's text and his poor presentation militated against any degree of success. Of the former, A. Victor Murray wrote to Oldham that

> . . . The text of his sermon was "To be urbanely minded

---

[1] Anson Phelps Stokes, Progress in Negro Status, p. 173.

[2] Agricultural Missions Foundation file, Carnegic Corporation of New York.

[3] Agricultural Missions Foundation, "Statement of Purpose," December 17, 1929, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-24. See also, Thomas Jesse Jones, "The Rural Billions and the Agricultural Missions Foundation," n.d. (Typewritten.)

268

> is death, but to be rurally minded is life and peace. . . ." None of these American chaps seems to be able to be practical. I never heard such mystical nonsense as he talked. . . .[1]

There was some reason to suspect that the precepts of Hampton and Tuskegee were being advanced a step further than even their founders had envisioned. Oldham's assistant feared that if Jones' principles of education were implemented through an organization such as the Agricultural Missions Foundation, the lid would be shut down on the whole African community and no one would have a chance of becoming anything but a farmer, thereby creating a dangerous and inequitable situation.[2]

The Le Zoute Conference strengthened a conviction which Anson Phelps Stokes had held for a number of years, viz., that the Phelps-Stokes Fund could provide no greater service than that of bringing selected individuals from Africa to America, not only to study American Negro education but to learn at first hand of Negro potentiality as it had evolved under white suzerainty in the American system.[3] This practice, of course, would provide an excellent opportunity to demonstrate the efficacy of the Tuskegee method of education for those visitors from Africa whom, it was hoped, would appreciate its applicability for their individual work. Although Le Zoute acted as a catalyst for Stokes in this regard, the Fund had initiated this practice as early as 1921, while the first Education Commission was still in Africa.[1] Indeed, the Fund allocated an average of $3000 per annum for this purpose between 1922 and the convening of the Le Zoute Conference in 1926.[2]

---

[1] Letter, Murray to Oldham, June 2, 1933, Edinburgh House Box 212.

[2] Memo, B. D. Gibson, n.d., but c. 1934, Edinburgh House Box 212.

[3] Anson Phelps Stokes, "Reminiscences," p. 100a(1).

One of the first participants in this scheme was Hanns Vischer, who was rushed to America immediately upon his appointment as Secretary of the British Advisory Committee on Native Education in Tropical Africa, so that could be imbued with the Hampton-Tuskegee philosophy. Among the other early visitors were: D. J. Oman, Director of Education of the Gold Coast; A. W. Wilkie, superintendent of the Scottish Mission Schools on the Gold Coast and a member of the first Phelps-Stokes Commission; Donald Malcolm, Chief Inspector of schools in Natal; Alexander Kerr, principal of the South African Native College, Fort Hare; and Archdeacon W. E. Owen, director of the Church Missionary Society in Kenya. During 1925 the Fund hosted a spate of guests from East and Central Africa, a direct result of the visit there by the second Education Commission. James W. C. Dougall, the first principal of the Jeanes School, Kabete, Kenya; H. S. Keigwin, the Director of Native Development in Southern Rhodesia; H. M. Grace of the Church Missionary Society, Uganda, and second principal of Achimota; Archdeacon Mathers of the Church Missionary Society, Uganda; Professor D. D. Westermann--these were only a few of the 1925 contingent. Although the sums involved were often nominal--e.g., Grace and Mathers received only $250 each, hardly enough to defray travelling expenses within the United States--arrangements were usually made between either the missionary society or the colonial government involved so that the visitors suffered little pecuniary hardship.

---

[1] Meeting of the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, November 10, 1921. The Trustees allocated $3500 for "general African work, especially bringing representative African educators to the U.S. to study."

[2] Meetings of the Executive Committee and the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, November 15, 1922, November 17, 1923, November 19, 1924, November 18, 1925.

The stated purpose of these visits was to enable the visitors

> to study the activities in the field of Negro education of the General Education Board, the Jeanes, Slater, and Rosenwald Funds, the leading institutions for Negroes in America, country training schools, the interracial cooperation movement in the southern . . . United States, the farm demonstration work of the Department of Agriculture. . . .[1]

The educational institutions visited were, invariably, Hampton, the Penn School, Tuskegee, and the Calhoun School. An occasional visitor would stop at Howard University in Washington, D.C., while visiting with Anson Phelps Stokes, by now a canon of Washington Cathedral; some at the Atlanta University complex, where they would be guided by President John Hope; and a few at the Meharry Medical School in Nashville, just to prove to themselves that black men could excel in work traditionally reserved for whites.

In preparation for their tour, a selected reading list--including Jones' Four Essentials of Education, Washington's Up from Slavery,

---

[1] Jones, Education in Africa, p. xx.

2 71

Woofter's The Basis of Racial Adjustment, and Work's Negro Year Book--was sent to the visitors before they arrived in New York. A course on Rural Methods of Education, offered at Teachers College, was also recommended, especially for the missionaries who worked in out-stations. Thus, it was hoped that through a combination of visits to various institutions and agencies, carefully selected contacts, appropriate reading material, lectures and courses propagating the desired point of view, the Phelps-Stokes visitors to America would be imbued with the efficacy of the educational methods propounded by Jones and would return to their work in Africa more dedicated to these principles than hitherto. It was through these visits that the desired cross-fertilization between educational work in the Negro South and black Africa was thought to have its optimum chance for success.

But all this cost money, a commodity with which the Fund was not overly endowed. In 1925 Jones sent a long memorandum to the Acting President of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, detailing the need for immediate action by America on behalf of Africa. He argued that intervention in African affairs was warranted by the applicability of American experience in the development of the great rural areas and in the education of the Negroes to current African conditions. Several projects, with emphasis on 'learning by doing,' were specifically outlined. Among these were: (1) study and observation of American activities by colonial officers, mission educators, and native educators; (2) financial aid and direction of African institutions for the training of Jeanes visiting teachers; (3) encouragement of interracial organizations in Africa; (4) encouragement of Adaptations of Education and of other activities relevant to the special conditions of Africans; and (5) organization and supervision of education and community improvement.[1] Within the year the Rockefeller group responded with a grant of $35,000 for this exploratory scheme,[2] and Stokes responded that Jones would spend the next calendar year devoting his major responsibility to African work.[3] Of this sum, $10,000 was immediately earmarked for visits of educators from Africa, and $8000 towards expenses of the Le Zoute Conference.[4]

But besides helping to finance some of its projects this allocation by the Rockefeller group also brought the differing philosophies of Jones and Oldham into sharper focus. The latter had also been in contact with the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial during 1925, and he informed Jones that he felt that one of the best means of obtaining fuller knowledge of the real nature of forces in African life would be through the establishment of a well-considered experiment at one point in East Africa. The research Oldham envisaged would include the

---

[1] Letter, Jones to Colonel Arthur Woods, June 1, 1925, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-5.

[2] Letter, Beardsley Ruml to Anson Phelps Stokes, April 9, 1926, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-5.

[3] Letter, Stokes to Ruml, April 7, 1926, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-5.

[4] Minutes of a Meeting of the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, May 28, 1926.

273

study of questions relating to the life and progress of the native people, e.g., such matters as native beliefs, habits, conditions of life and social organization, methods of native production and their improvement. He informed Jones that he had asked the Memorial for $50,000 per annum for this project.[1] In the margin of the letter Jones scribbled, "research vs. research by doing."

Jones countered by stating that, "I am decidedly of the opinion that research is inclined to be artificial," and went on to point out that the research value of the practical activities of the General Education Board were far greater than those of the more purely research work of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial. More important than abstract research, Jones claimed, was the encouragement of such men as Keigwin, Loram, Laws of Livingstonia, Henderson of Lovedale, and Guggisberg, who had already proven the wisdom and effectiveness of their work.[2] Only through this encouragement could the African work realize its full potential.

This approach, which Oldham considered dangerously parochial, prompted him to warn Jones that he was in danger of allowing himself to fall into the trap where all decisions become matters of "either . . . or" instead of "both . . . and." Oldham recognized the fundamental truth of the "learning by doing" approach, but told his friend that it was not the sole panacea for conquering the world's, and particularly Africa's, problems.[1] From which direction or which source help for Africa came was not important to Oldham just so long as it was forthcoming. The implication, of course, was that Jones was not quite so open-minded.

---

[1] Letter, Oldham to Jones, October 26, 1925, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-5. One observer feels that the only way Oldham could check the tendencies of Kenya's white settlers in their desire to exclude the African from political parity in Kenya in the early 1920's was by employing a new instrument--research. To this end he entered discussions with officials of the Rockefeller Foundation. See George Bennett, "Paramountcy to Partnership: J. H. Oldham and Africa," Africa, XXX (October, 1960), 356-361.

[2] Letter, Jones to Oldham, November 18, 1925, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-5.

But even as this exchange was taking place, Jones was pushing ahead with a far larger proposal for consideration by the Rockefeller group than the previous scheme. His chief collaborator was Loram, and during 1926 they hammered out details of a plan which they were certain would give direction to African education in East, South, and Central Africa for the forseeable future. At the core of this design was the Jeanes supervisory teacher, an individual whose efficacy for Africa neither Jones nor Loram doubted for a moment. The plans were ambitious; Loram suggested establishment of Jeanes training centers in Northern Rhodesia, Transvaal, Bechuanaland, Natal, Basutoland, Cape Province, Nyasaland, Portuguese East Africa, Tanganyika, Uganda, Zanzibar, and Southern Rhodesia.[2] These would supplement the pioneer school at Kabete, Kenya; influential sympathizers--Keigwin in Southern

---

[1] Letter, Oldham to Jones, December 8, 1925, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-5.

[2] Letter, Loram to Jones, August 14, 1926, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-5.

275

Rhodesia, Rivers-Smith in Tanganyika, John Fell in Northern Rhodesia, to mention only a few--would help perpetuate the scheme. Loram was not overly concerned about the lack of properly trained principals to head the schools; he felt that after his association with Jones, his study of the Four Essentials, and his visits to Kabete and America, he could make the teachers as he had done in Natal.[1]

Jones pinned great hopes on the Rockefeller groups, especially in view of the $35,000 exploratory grant to the Phelps-Stokes Fund in 1926. On February 19, 1927, he submitted a formal proposal to the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, requesting that $135,850 be granted to the Phelps-Stokes Fund as executor for educational work in Africa.[2] Within two weeks he met with Leonard Outhwaite, a director of the Memorial, and the session was obviously somewhat strained. Jones could neither accept that the Memorial was as research-oriented as Outhwaite had implied nor that research was a valid precondition for action. Outhwaite noted that perhaps more anthropological research should be undertaken before the Memorial committed itself to such an expenditure. Disregarding this, Jones snapped that there were enough facts in the realm of hygiene and sanitation, economic welfare, conditions of women and children, and recreative needs to justify educational and social welfare activities such as those he had outlined,

---

[1] Letter, Loram to Jones, March 4, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-5.

[2] Letter, Jones to Beardsley Ruml, February 19, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-5.

276

and that further research, of whatever nature, would be redundant. Besides, he argued, the Visiting Teacher plan would furnish more opportunities for the study of native life than the more theoretical methods could.[1]

Even when it was obvious that the Phelps-Stokes Fund would not receive the funds it had requested,[2] neither Jones nor Stokes could accept the verdict.[3] The formal refusal was not long in coming.[4] Jones' disappointment and anger were directed partly at Oldham--"my suspicious nature sometimes leads me to think that he has been too favorable to research as against the practical approach in which we believe--and partly at Africa--"if we cannot be used in connection with Africa, there are other parts of the world in need."[5]

Nor was there much hope that the forthcoming visit by the President and Secretary of the Carnegie Corporation to East and South

---

[1] Letter, Jones to Leonard Outhwaite, March 3, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-5.

[2] Oldham wrote to Jones, April 27, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-5, that Colonel Woods had phoned him and said that the Jeanes plan was only "a little bit of the whole and the Memorial cannot consider entering the field until a larger plan had been worked out. . . ."

[3] Jones to Raymond Fosdick (a Trustee of the Memorial), May 18, 1927, and Stokes to John D. Rockefeller, Jr., May 21, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-5.

[4] Letter, Fosdick to Stokes, May 25, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-5.

[5] Letter, Jones to Loram, May 27, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-5.

Africa would bring monetary dividends for Jones' program. Even before they departed Jones was aware that they would probably favor pure research as against the practical approach of the Jeanes program. And also, the provisions of the Carnegie trust made it highly unlikely that the Corporation would spend much money on black Africans.[1] But the Corporation's officers proved considerably more sympathetic to the Jeanes visiting teacher plan than Jones had expected, and soon the school at Kabete, which had been founded by a Carnegie grant, was not the sole outpost in East Africa.[2]

The Carnegie Corporation also gave a much needed financial boost to the bursary of the Agricultural Missions Foundation, largely at Jones' urging. Early in 1933 the Corporation granted $10,000 to the Foundation toward support of a program of rural training for American missionaries to British Africa; later in the year Jones asked Keppel for an additional $15,000, which was soon forthcoming.[1] The next year Jones succeeded in prising loose $3000 from John D. Rockefeller, Jr. for the Foundation, an allocation which was especially gratifying in view of the Rockefeller foundation's well-known penchant for research.[2]

---

[1] Letter, Jones to Loram, June 3, 1927, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-5. James Bertram, the Secretary of the Corporation, interpreted one of the provisions of the Carnegie trust in such a way that although financial assistance could be provided for Africa, it could be granted only to those areas where such aid would be beneficial to the white settlers as well as to the Africans.

[2] In the preliminary report of his trip, Keppel noted that "without question the most important single step in the advancement of the African native has been the adaptation, under the leadership of Dr. Jesse Jones and Dr. J. H. Dillard of the Phelps-Stokes Commission, of the principle of supervision which has been so successful in our Negro schools." He went on to mention the possibility of helping to establish Jeanes schools in Uganda, Northern and Southern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, and South Africa. Mss., no. I, Africa, 21140, copy in Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-1. See also Richard D. Heyman, "The Role of the Carnegie Corporation of New York in African Education," forthcoming doctoral thesis, Teachers College.

By 1945, John Reisner, the Agricultural Missions Foundation's Director who had become a Phelps-Stokes Fund trustee in 1944, could report that ninety-three travel and study fellowships, amounting to almost $36,000 had been granted to British and American missionaries and governmental officials in British Africa; some 200 missionaries to Africa had attended short courses dealing with rural life and agriculture, home and family life, health and nutrition, and rural church and community programs; and itineraries for at least 250 missionaries had been arranged for observation and study of rural schools and community projects in the Southern United States.[3]

---

[1] Letters, John Reisner to Jones, January 13, 1933; Jones to F. P. Keppel, December 18, 1933; and Keppel to Jones, April 20, 1934, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-24.

[2] Letters, Arthur Packard to Jones, February 27, 1934; and Jones to Packard, March 7, 1934, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-24. Shortly after refusing Jones' 1927 request for funds for Jeanes schools in East, Central, and South Africa, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, acting largely on Oldham's initiative, allocated an annual grant for five years to found the International Institute of African Languages and Cultures. In 1931, the year that Oldham became Administrative Director of the Institute, the Rockefeller Foundation allocated $50,000 to ensure the Institute's financial stability. See "International Institute of African Languages and Cultures," March, 1930, confidential copy in Phelps-Stokes Fund file N-100.

[3] Letter, John Reisner to Stokes, October 31, 1945, Phelps-Stokes Fund file C-24.

## African Students in America

If the Phelps-Stokes Fund hoped to influence the direction of African education through exposure of missionaries and government officials from Africa to the American Negro educational experience, it soon realized that this represented a tangential approach, and that African students themselves would have to be educated in the United States if the full impact of the specially adapted education was to be transferred in Africa. Between 1911 and 1946 many African students passed through the offices of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, few of whom were actually sponsored by the Fund but most seeking financial assistance. Those destined for fame and those destined for obscurity came, wrote, importuned, and usually received at least a sympathetic ear if not any financial assistance. Among the former were Azikiwe, Mbadiwe, and Orizu from Nigeria; Gardinier and Nkrumah from Ghana; and Karefa-Smart from Sierra Leone.[1] During its first thirty-five years, the Phelps-Stokes Fund granted almost $21,000 to African students in the United States, and by no means was this restricted to those enrolled at schools on the Hampton-Tuskegee model.[2]

The problem of the African student falling under the influence of the "radical" Negro camp was a danger of which Jones was only too well aware; however, this had to be weighed against the beneficial

---

[1] See Phelps-Stokes Fund file B-4.

[2] Stokes, Progress in Negro Status, p. 173.

280

effect of exposure to the Hampton-Tuskegee educational experience and the various movements of interracial cooperation. It was soon obvious, however, that the small coterie of African scholars, fully cognizant of its elite status, would not be content to accept the values of Jones' adapted education, and the Fund began to look as much for the cooperative spirit as for that which would accept the Hampton-Tuskegee curriculum.[1]

When Aggrey died in 1927 Jones began casting about for another black apostle of cooperation who would spread the Phelps-Stokes creed, and he soon tapped Ross Lohr, a Sierra Leonean who was studying at Ottenbein College in Ohio.[2] Jones provided Lohr with funds from the Phelps-Stokes allocations and assiduously guided him to Hampton, to Tuskegee, to the Teachers College department of Rural Education. Plans were laid whereby Lohr would return to Sierra Leone in 1930 as the Assistant to H. S. Keigwin, who had left Southern Rhodesia and was, from 1927, the Director of Education in the West African colony. But Keigwin was invalided home in 1930, his successor knew of no arrangements which had been discussed, and there was not enough money to hire Lohr, who began teaching at Hampton, where he remained until 1946, by which time Jones had left the Phelps-Stokes Fund.[1]

---

[1] A group of African students at Tuskegee in 1924 issued a statement to the effect that while Jones' emphasis on the four Simples (as expounded in Education in Africa) was laudable, provision must also be made for the growth of higher education in Africa. See "Fifth Annual Conference of the African Students Union," Tuskegee Student, XXXV (March, 1924), 5.

[2] E. Hursh, a professor at Ottenbein, wrote to Jones, August 29, 1927, barely two months after Aggrey's death, that he was "gratified" that Lohr was being considered as Aggrey's successor, Phelps-Stokes Fund file B-4.

There were two other African students upon whom Jones pinned great hopes for the propagation of the Phelps-Stokes Fund gospel in East and West Africa. Eyo Ita was educated at the Hope Waddell Training Institute, Calabar, Nigeria, and arrived at Teachers College in 1930, where he studied Rural Education. The next summer Ita visited both Hampton and Tuskegee with the Fund's blessing, and was suitably impressed with what he witnessed.

In 1933 he took a position at the Baptist College, Ogbomosho, Nigeria, and immediately attempted to implement some of the Tuskegee/Jones principles of education. But he was soon discouraged and recognized that education alone, without a change in the entire social structure, could not be a panacea for development. "The gospel of better industry and more production seems . . . futile, for already the people have more than enough to eat and the surplus finds no market anywhere."[2] Ita initiated 4-H clubs, art clubs, hygiene training, youth leagues, but recognized that this would not be enough, that someday someone would have to recognize and act upon the relationship between education and economics.[3] He asked how the people could be kept on the land when the realities of agricultural production did not coincide with their goal aspirations.[1] This was the same question for which Jones had no appropriate answer at the time of the first African Education Commission tour in 1920-21.

---

[1] Phelps-Stokes Fund file B-4.

[2] Letter, Ita to Jones, March 22, 1934, Phelps-Stokes Fund file B-4.

[3] Letter, Ita to Jones, February 7, 1935, Phelps-Stokes Fund file B-4.

To Ita's plea for advice and justification of what he was attempting to do, Jones responded with a circular letter, entitled "A Message to an Able and Devoted African Whose Studies and Experiences in England and America Filled Him with Perplexity and Disappointment When He Returned Home,"[2] which was more a polemic against political activism and a justification of the four Simples than it was a response to Ita's pleas.

Jones wrote that Ita's commonsense, which impelled him to recognize the importance of health and sanitation, of soil and agriculture, of sound family life, and of mental and spiritual development, was conflicting with his "acquired beliefs" in social and economic abstractions which resulted from his overseas' study. Regarding the marketing problem, Jones stated that it "involves intricate conditions and forces far beyond not only your experience and studies but also that of the American and English lecturers whom you heard." In short, Jones said, Ita should not be concerned with it for it was none of his business. Similarly, Ita's relationships to the existing educational policies and organizations in Nigeria could only be developed on the basis of long and intimate experience and through understanding which, of course, Jones implied, Ita did not possess. And to cap off this non-answer, Jones reiterated the importance of the four Simples, the role of Mother Earth in African education, the importance of the Jeanes supervisory teachers, and finally advised Ita

---

[1] Letter, Ita to Jones, February 7, 1935, Phelps-Stokes Fund file B-4.

[2] Phelps-Stokes Fund file A-19, dated January 1, 1935.

> . . . to remember Christ's prayer of thanksgiving and follow the impulses of your own commonsense rather than the vague implications of the so-called "wise and prudent," whom you heard in London and New York. Remember also that remarkable Beatitude: "Blessed are the gentle, for they shall inherit the gratitude of Humanity."[1]

But Ita could not accept this passivity and soon became a strong advocate of Nigerian cultural nationalism.[2]

Ernest Kalibala arrived in the United States from Uganda in 1924 and, under an arrangement worked out between Jones and H. M. Grace of the Uganda Church Missionary Society, proceeded directly to Tuskegee. However, the next year he displayed a dissatisfaction with the course of study there and, over Jones' strong protestations, transferred to the more academically-oriented, but lesser known, Lincoln Academy in North Carolina.[3] From Hampton Institute, which he liked considerably more than Tuskegee, he informed Jones in 1929 that his investigations had led him to conclude that the Institute was doing very little to implement the four Simples in the surrounding community, an assessment which Hampton's principal could not deny.[1] This cognizance of the importance of the four Simples and their relevance to the community restored Kalibala to the good graces of the Phelps-Stokes Fund.

---

[1] Jones, Memorandum, January 1, 1935, Phelps-Stokes Fund file A-19.

[2] James S. Coleman, Nigeria--Background to Nationalism (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960), pp. 218-220.

[3] Letter, Kalibala to Jones, July 2, 1926; Jones to Kalibala, July 19, 1926, Phelps-Stokes Fund file B-4.

In 1930 Kalibala enrolled in New York University and three years later received a Master's degree from Teachers College, Columbia University, in Rural Education. He charged in his thesis that Native Education was a phrase frequently used to signify a body of ideas Europeans felt suitable to the African mentality and arranged without any regard to the development of the African as a whole person. The concepts embodied in Native Education were "abstract aims, formless and void of substance." He also had the temerity to challenge Jones' assumption that Africans would remain on the land indefinitely.[2]

Kalibala returned to Uganda in 1934 with his American wife and immediately ran afoul of the local educational establishment which, he felt, was interested only in perpetuating the status quo. One commentator noted that he had demanded an extravagant salary and would not teach in a Church Missionary Society school. He was then appointed Assistant Secretary of Education of the Church Missionary Society in Uganda, but soon resigned his post and founded the independent Aggrey

---

[1] Letters, Kalibala to Jones, December 28, 1929; and J. Gregg to Jones, January 17, 1930, Phelps-Stokes Fund file B-4.

[2] Ernest Kalibala, "Education for Villages in Uganda, East Africa" (unpublished Master of Arts Thesis, Teachers College, 1934), pp. 32 and 44.

285

Memorial School outside Kampala.[1] When, in 1938, he returned to New York in an attempt to solicit funds for the school, Anson Phelps Stokes wrote to the Ugandan Director of Education to ascertain the school's status. On the basis of the Director's highly critical report, the Phelps-Stokes Fund declined to appropriate any funds towards this venture.[2] This refusal of aid to an independent school was in keeping with Jones' oft-repeated assertion that they were of no use in Africa. It is noteworthy that the Aggrey Memorial School is today a full-fledged secondary institution, still independent of mission or government control.[3]

Jones felt that both Ita and Kalibala had let him down, and he ascribed their wanderings from the truth of the four Simples (but had they really wandered, or were they merely questioning Jones' judgment?) "to the teachings of radical thinkers in this country and in the United Kingdom [which] have had such an unfortunate effect." These disappointments convinced him "that African students should come to this country only for a brief period and that after they have been carefully instructed in Africa."[4] Although few African students carried the Phelps-Stokes gospel of education back to Africa, there can be little doubt that the financial and psychological assistance which the Fund did provide proved of inestimable benefit in helping many of these students complete their studies in the United States. It is more than a little ironical, of course, that two of those whom the Fund aided from time to time--Azikiwe and Nkrumah--gave short shrift to the concept of agricultural and industrial education as espoused by Jones and returned to West Africa to play crucial roles in bringing to an end that authority which Jones' concept of education was intended to perpetuate.

---

[1] Letter, A. T. Scofield to Jones, May 2, 1935, Phelps-Stokes Fund file B-4.

[2] Letters, Stokes to J. H. Jowitt, December 9, 1938; and Jowitt to Stokes, January 4, 1939, Phelps-Stokes Fund file B-4.

[3] I am indebted to Mr. Barnabas Otaala for this information.

[4] Letter, Jones to A. T. Scofield, June 20, 1935, Phelps-Stokes Fund file B-4.

# CHAPTER VIII

# CONCLUSIONS

Influenced by the philosophies of Armstrong and Frissell of Hampton, Washington of Tuskegee, Dillard of the Jeanes Fund, Buttrick of the General Education Board, and the whole complex of racial, social, economic and political ideologies which determined the direction of Negro education after the American Civil War, Jones was little more than a product of his times. His influence and prestige were buttressed by the timeliness of the appearance of the Phelps-Stokes Fund's study on Negro education and by the similar philosophies of education which were evolving in Great Britain as a result of the necessity of finding an educational complement to the political philosophy of Indirect Rule. The Phelps-Stokes Fund, which Jones served so loyally and so long, provided a forum from which various pronouncements regarding the welfare of Negroes and Africans could emanate. The Fund also gave wholehearted support to its Educational Director's philosophy, which soon became its policy.

The Fund's detractors, of whom there were a considerable number, tended to neglect the fact that had the Phelps-Stokes Fund advocated policies too far ahead of the sentiments of the day, it would have accomplished very little indeed. Working through the Establishment, of which it was a member,[1] the Phelps-Stokes Fund gauged the climate of the times and geared its work just a step ahead. The many movements for interracial cooperation, both in the American South and in South Africa, were actions hardly intended to endear the Fund to the majority of the white constituencies in either locale. In 1939 Anson Phelps Stokes led a fight against a ruling by the Daughters of the American Revolution, which had refused to allow Marian Anderson to sing, because of her color, in Constitution Hall in Washington, D.C., a building which the group owned.[2] Two years later Stokes organized the Committee on Negro Americans in Defense Industries to ensure that Negroes would receive fair treatment in employment practices.[3]

In 1942 a study by the Committee on Africa, the War, and Peace Aims, of which Stokes was chairman and Jones a member, issued a report[4] dealing with the application of the eight points of the Atlantic Charter to the problems of African welfare. Clinging to the concept that Indirect Rule was the best of the existing forms of colonial government to meet local needs, the report did note that the goal of ultimate self-government should be accepted in every colony. At the same time it called for equality for the African, albeit couched in somewhat paternalistic terms.[1]

---

[1] Harlan, Separate and Unequal, p. 87, asserts that the Fund was "free of the interlocking directorate, [and] brought . . . a fresh approach to the problem of Negro education." Nothing could be further from the truth, as I trust has been made abundantly clear from the above.

[2] See Anson Phelps Stokes, Art and the Color Line (Washington, D.C.: n.p., 1939).

[3] See "Report of the Educational Director, 1940-41," Phelps-Stokes Fund file A-19.

[4] The Atlantic Charter and Africa from an American Standpoint (New York: n.p., 1942).

In the section dealing with social essentials, however, the report lapsed into a recantation of most of Jones' dated ideas concerning the importance of agricultural and industrial education for a people who are destined to remain on the land. And as a sop to those who would deny the African education *qua* education for fear of the economic, social, and political ramifications involved, the report noted that the education of the Southern Negro had proved a great boon to the economic advancement of the community as a whole. Although they were hardly equalitarians, Jones and Stokes did work for the betterment--social, economic, political--of the black man; however, there is scant evidence that either envisioned the day when the black man in America would demand equality outside the caste system or the black man in Africa would govern his independent country. Social, political, and economic advancement were worthy goals until such time that they impinged on white hegemony.

Despite his weaknesses as an educational theorist, a sociologist, and an economist, Jones' program of education for Africa was not totally without redeeming features. His arguments that health and hygiene, appreciation of the environment, homelife, and recreative needs should all play a larger part in the formal school structure were very valid, as was his attempt to relate school to community. The obvious shortcomings of his advocacy in this realm, however, were that there was little more to his program than these four Essentials, that they were almost completely unrelated to social structure, and that, if implemented would have meant that the mass of Africans would be relegated to a caste from which there would be no escape. It is on this latter point that Jones' oft-repeated assertion that his educational program was equalitarian must be questioned.

---

[1] *The Atlantic Charter and Africa from an American Standpoint*, p. 104.

His recommendations concerning the need for better school inspection, the formation of local Boards of Education, and more cooperation between the various educational agencies in Africa were all reasonable and timely. These positive features, however, have been overshadowed by his attempts to anesthetize the African--and the Southern Negro as well--from political consciousness through a curriculum which would perpetuate his subordinate status. His understanding of the relationship between education and economics was limited to the knowledge that a Negro or African provided with a literary education would not long remain a very pliable economic tool. Indeed, as late as 1939 he wrote that "the fact is that the Southern States require the Negro *at least for his services as a laborer*."[1]

---

[1] Letter, Jones to H. L. West, May 6, 1939, American Colonization Society Papers, Library of Congress. Italics added.

Equalitarianism was subservient to economic value just so long as the labor was black.

But, one must ask, would Jones' ideas have gained such currency had he been anything but a product of his times? In the 1920's he was in the mainstream of African educational ideology; by the 1930's he was falling behind men like Oldham and Fraser, who recognized that Africans would not accept what the British Advisory Committee and the Phelps-Stokes Fund had attempted to spoonfeed them. The De La Warr and Asquith Commissions of the late 1930's and 1940's, with their calls for African universities, sounded the death knell not only of Indirect Rule but of any fading hopes which Jones and the Fund still entertained about the implementation of their educational creed.[1]

One of the pillars of Phelps-Stokes Fund policy was the belief that an objective study of the Negro problem would bring the truth to public notice. The fellowships for the study of the Negro at the universities of Georgia and Virginia were the initial steps in this direction. And since there was no better road to objectivity than unassailable statistics, Jones relied very heavily on figures to prove that the white community was not only concerned about, but was actively engaged in, the betterment of the plight of the Negro in America. The survey of Negro education, replete with figures, charts, and diagrams illustrating the increase in land holdings, bank accounts, and home ownership among Southern Negroes, concluded that these increases were evidence of the concern of the white community--without which such advantages could not have been gained--for Negro education. And since most of that education provided between 1865 and 1910 had been vocational in nature, there was little need to change the curriculum to a more literary bias, as some "radicals" were demanding. Increased material benefits for the Negro were enough to confirm Jones in his conviction that only through agricultural and industrial education could the black man in America be raised to an economic plateau approaching that of his white brethren.

---

[1] See Ashby, Universities: British, Indian, African, pp. 197-223.

The reports of the two African Education Commissions were further attempts to bring unassailable (at least in the view of the Commissioners) statistical data to bear on the problem of African welfare. Stokes arranged the conference between Jan Smuts and some leaders in the field of American race relations in the belief that from this contact the South African could gain a better appreciation of the potentiality of the Negro in America and, by extension, of the African in South Africa.

It was this belief in the power of empirical data to facilitate better understanding which led Stokes into the project on the Encyclopedia of the Negro in 1931. He felt that the scope and plan of the Encyclopedia would "represent a permanent contribution towards ultimate solution of the [race] problem."[1] But the project, ill-conceived and poorly financed, only opened another chapter in the long battle between Carter G. Woodson and the Phelps-Stokes Fund.[1]

---

[1] Letter, Stokes to F. P. Keppel, November 14, 1938, Carnegic Corporation of New York file on the Encyclopedia of the Negro.

From its incorporation in 1911 until 1945 the Phelps-Stokes Fund based its actions on several premises: (1) that the experience of the Negro South was directly relevant to black Africa; (2) that neither the African nor the American Negro would be self-governing, or even have a large say in his welfare for the forseeable future; (3) that the policy of gradualism, in education as well as in politics, was the only safe one; and (4) that Africa and the Negro South would remain rural indefinitely. These premises were a logical outcome of the historical processes which had led Samuel Chapman Armstrong to launch Hampton Institute, Booker T. Washington to create Tuskegee in its image while eschewing political equality, and the Capon Springs Conferences for Education in the South to institutionalize a 'special education' for Southern Negroes. Jones and Stokes were direct descendants of these historical events, and their influence was greatly augmented by the cooperation of American philanthropic groups, the Colonial Office's Advisory Committee on Native Education in Tropical Africa, and mission groups in Great Britain and North America.

During the 1920's and 1930's Jones and the Phelps-Stokes Fund could not accept that Africans should have a voice in their educational future. Consequently, they clung tenaciously to the concept

---

[1] Letter, Woodson to Benjamin Brawley, November 28, 1931, NAACP Papers, Box C-80, Library of Congress; and Woodson to the Editor, The Afro-American, June 3, 1936.

294

of adapted education. Ranger has noted the perversity of this lack of awareness of African aspirations. The Africans, he pointed out, "were not demanding white restriction of educational form and content in the interests of the preservation of what whites thought to be valuable in African life." And yet, "these were the years of the Jeanes teacher-training centres where Africans were instructed how to impart educational essentials in a relevant manner."[1] The limited success of the Booker Washington Institute in Liberia and the failure to implement the major recommendations of the two African Education Commissions demonstrated that imposition of educational concepts incompatible with African aspirations was chimerical.

Notwithstanding this limited vision, Jones' work in Negro education and on the African Education Commissions projected him, and the organization he represented, into the forefront of African educational planning. There he joined J. H. Oldham, Charles T. Loram, Frederick Lugard, Hanns Vischer, and D. D. Westermann, the Director of the International Institute of African Languages and Cultures and former collaborator of James L. Sibley in Liberia. Together with Stokes, Jones used his contacts and influence to help prime the financial pumps of other philanthropic organizations for aid to American Negro and African education. His was certainly an important influence in the allocation of the $500,000 which the Carnegie Corporation appropriated for its African work in 1927. The General Education Board and the Carnegie Corporation made grants to Southern Negro schools largely on Jones' recommendations. But while this ability to raise money for certain institutions resulted from the recognition of his expertise in the educational problems of Africans and American Negroes, it should be remembered that neither his ideas nor his approach was innovative; both simply came at an opportune time in the educational history of America and Africa.

---

[1] T. O. Ranger, "African Attempts to Control Education in East and Central Africa, 1900-1939," Past and Present, XXXII (December, 1965), 68.

The Hampton-Tuskegee-Jones philosophy of education can be found in the writings of such an early African nationalist as Blyden,[1] and such a latter-day one as Nyerere.[2] In between the South African Government has attempted to implement its own modified version of this philosophy with the passage in 1953 of the Bantu Education Act and its subsequent amendments.[3] No objective observer, of course, could imply that the Phelps-Stokes Fund was responsible for the wisdom of the one or the iniquity of the other. One wonders, however, if the assessment by L. J. Lewis, that "the [Phelps-Stokes] reports still offer sound guidance about planning educational developments,"[1] does not tend to be overly sanguine. Lewis' generation of colonial administrators in Africa tended to accept the creed espoused by Jones with scant references to their African constituency. Lewis' apologia ignores the central point that implementation of the Phelps-Stokes/ Advisory Committee concept of education would have radically altered the course of modern African history, and not in the African's favor. For a long time the Phelps-Stokes Fund advocated a policy which was not only inapplicable but which had strong racist overtones as well. Despite this, the Fund continued to advocate, as did the British Advisory Committee which, however, understood the realities sooner than did Jones and Stokes. It would appear that neither Jones nor Stokes was aware that only when a tradition is bankrupt is its efficacy unduly insisted upon.

---

[1] Hollis Lynch, *Edward Wilmot Blyden, Pan-African Patriot* (London: Oxford University Press), 1967), pp. 150-151. Although Blyden strongly favored the classical curriculum, he was not adverse to allowing students to devote a portion of their time to manual labor.

[2] Julius Nyerere, *The Arusha Declaration and TANU's Policy on Socialism and Self-Reliance* (Dar Es Salaam: TANU Publicity Section, 1967), pp. 14-18. Nyerere states that agriculture is the basis of development and that, since the economy of Tanzania depends and will depend on agriculture and animal husbandry, Tanzanians must learn to develop the land properly.

[3] See Muriel Horrell, *A Decade of Bantu Education* (Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations, 1964).

Jones' insistence on the efficacy of narrowly vocational education as the sole panacea for African development precluded any thoughts about the day when Africans would rule their independent countries. Nyerere of Tanzania, for example, well understands the importance of agricultural education for a nation which is overwhelmingly rural. At the same time, however, he is fully cognizant of the need for university graduates in the arts and sciences, as well as for a strong cadre of high level technical manpower. Perhaps Jones' educational program for Africa would have had a greater chance of implementation had it made allowances for both options. Such a course might well have checked the accusations that the Phelps-Stokes Fund was more interested in perpetuating white hegemony in both Africa and America than it was in fostering black equality.

---

[1] L. J. Lewis, Education and Political Independence in Africa (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1962), p. 55.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Primary Sources

### Archival Materials

Archives of the Carnegie Corporation of New York. New York.

Archives of the Conference of Missionary Societies in Great Britain and Ireland (Edinburgh House). London.

Archives of the Division of the National Council of Churches of Christ. InterChurch Center, New York.
    Minutes of the Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, 1919-1920.

Great Britain. Public Record Office MSS. Colonial Office, Africa (New Series), United Kingdom, 1924-25.

Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
    Papers of Carter G. Woodson.
    Papers of the American Colonization Society.
    Papers of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Phelps-Stokes Fund Archives, New York.
    Diary of the African Education Commission.
    Files A-1 through Z-100.
    Minutes of the Executive Committee and Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, 3 vols., 1910-1950.
    Minutes and Papers of The Advisory Committee on Education in Liberia. 1924-1950.
    Minutes and Papers of the New York State Colonization Society. 1850-1950.
    Stokes, Olivia Egleston Phelps. "The Story of Caroline Phelps Stokes." Lenox, Mass., 1927. (Typewritten.)

Rhodes House Library. Oxford, England.
    A. G. Fraser Papers.

Yale University Library. New Haven, Connecticut.
    Papers of Anson Phelps Stokes.
    Papers of Charles T. Loram.

## Interviews

Interviews were held with the following:

Mr. Rudolph Aggrey
Mrs. Olivia Stokes Hatch
Dr. F. D. Patterson
Dr. and Mrs. Emory Ross
Mr. I. N. P. Stokes
Mrs. Carolyn Jones Williams.

## Materials in Private Possession

Jones, Thomas Jesse. Notes on Sermons delivered at Hampton Institute, 1903-1909. In the possession of his daughter, Mrs. Carolyn Jones Williams of Middletown, Pennsylvania.

Stokes, Anson Phelps. "Reminiscences of Anson Phelps Stokes, 1874-1954." In the possession of his son, Mr. I. N. P. Stokes of New York.

## Books and Articles

Armstrong, Samuel Chapman. Ideas on Education. Hampton, Virginia: Hampton Institute Press, 1908.

Great Britain. Colonial Office. Educational Policy in British Tropical Africa. Cmd., 2374, xxi, 1925.

Jones, Thomas Jesse. Education in Africa: A Study of West, South, and Equatorial Africa, by the African Education Commission. New York: Phelps-Stokes Fund, [1922].

________. Education in East Africa: A Study of East, Central and South Africa by the Second African Education Commission, under the auspices of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, in cooperation with the International Education Board. London: Edinburgh House, 1925.

________. Negro Education, A Survey of the Private and Higher Schools for Colored People in the United States. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1917.

Loram, Charles T. "Address by Charles T. Loram, of the Native Affairs Commission, Union of South Africa, on the Occasion of a Dinner in His Honor by the Phelps-Stokes Fund at 101 Park Avenue, New York, October 25, 1926." New York: Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1926.

## Secondary Sources

### Books and Articles

Aggrey, J. E. K. "Africa." Christian Students and World Problems. Report of the Ninth International Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 1923. Edited by Milton Stauffer. New York: Student Volunteer Movement, 1924.

_______. "The Native Students of Africa." The Student World, XVI (1923), 68-70.

Ajayi, J. F. Ade. Christian Missions in Nigeria, 1841-1891: The Making of a New Elite. Evanston: Northwestern Univeristy Press, 1965.

Allen, Gardner Weld. The Trustees of Donations for Education in Liberia: a Story of Philanthropic Endeavor, 1850-1923. Boston: Thomas Todd and Company, 1923.

Anderson, Lewis Flint. The History of Manual and Industrial Education. New York: Appleton Century Croft, 1926.

Appleton's Cyclopedia of American Biography. 1st edition. 1888.

Armah, Aryee Quaye. "Pan-Africanism and the White Man's Burden." Harvard Journal for Negro Affairs, I (December, 1965), 27-40.

Ashby, Eric. Universities: British, Indian, African. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolsan, 1966.

Ashmore, Harry J. The Negro and the Schools. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1954.

Azikiwe, Nnamdi. Liberia in World Politics. London: A. H. Stockwell Ltd., 1934.

Bailey, Joseph C. Seaman A. Knapp: Scholmaster of American Agriculture. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1945.

Baker, Ray Stannard. Following the Color Line. New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1908.

Beard, Augustus Field. A Crusade of Brotherhood; A History of the American Missionary Association. Boston: The Pilgram Press, 1909.

Bennett, George. Kenya, A Political History. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

________. "Paramountcy to Partnership: J. H. Oldham and Africa." Africa, XXX (October, 1960), 356-361.

Bentley, George R. A History of the Freedmen's Bureau. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955.

Best, John H., ed. Benjamin Franklin on Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, 1962.

Bond, Horace Mann. The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order. 2nd ed. New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1966.

Brawley, Benjamin. A Short History of the American Negro. 4th ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939.

________. Doctor Dillard of the Jeanes Fund. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1930.

Brookes, Edgar H. R. J.: John David Rheinallt Jones, in Appreciation of His Life and Work. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations, 1953.

Brown, Godfrey N. "British Educational Policy in West and Central Africa." African Studies, II, no. 3 (1964), 365-377.

Buell, Raymond L. Liberia: A Century of Survival, 1847-1947. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1947.

________. "Slavery in Liberia." News Bulletin of the Foreign Policy Association, X (January 16, 1931), 1-2.

________. The Native Problem in Africa. 2 vols. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.

Bullock, Henry Allen. A History of Negro Education in the South from 1619 to the Present. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Butcher, Margaret Just. The Negro in American Culture. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956.

Coleman, James S. Nigeria, Background to Nationalism. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.

Coleman, J. F. B. "An African Tuskegee." The Southern Voice, XV (January, 1918), 2-4.

The Committee on Africa, The War, and Peace Aims. The Atlantic Charter and Africa from an American Standpoint. New York: n.p., 1942.

A Consultative Member of the Conference. "Impressions of Le Zoute." The International Review of Missions, XVI (January, 1927), 36-45.

Coupland, R. "The Native Problem in Africa." Review of The Native Problem in Africa, by Raymond L. Buell. The International Review of Missions, July, 1929, pp. 381-389.

Cowan, L. Gray; O'Connell, James; and Scanlon, David G., eds. Education and Nation Building in Africa. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965.

Cremin, Laurence A. The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957. New York: Vintage Books, 1961.

Curry, J. L. M. Education of Negroes Since 1860. Baltimore: n.p., 1894.

Curti, Merle. The Social Ideas of American Educators. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.

Dabney, Charles W. Universal Education in the South. 2 vols. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1936.

Davis, Jackson. "British Africa and the South." The Virginia Quarterly Review, Summer, 1937, pp. 362-375.

Dewey, John. Democracy and Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916.

Dickerman, George. "The History of Negro Education." Negro Education, A Survey of the Private and Higher Schools for Colored People in the United States. Thomas Jesse Jones. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1917, pp. 243-268.

Dictionary of American Biography. 1st ed. 1936. Vols. 14 and 18.

Dillard, J. H. "Education in Africa." Review of Education in Africa, by Thomas Jesse Jones. New York Evening Post, November 18, 1922.

Dorf, Philip. Liberty Hyde Bailey. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1956.

Dougall, J. W. C. Religious Education in Africa. London: International Missionary Council, n.d.

Dougall, J. W. C. "Training Visiting Teachers for African Village Schools." The Southern Workman, XVII (October, 1928), 403-414.

Du Bois, W. E. B. "A Plan for Africa." The Crisis, XXXI (January, 1926), 113-114.

________. Black Reconstruction. Philadelphia: Albert Saifer Publications, 1935.

________. "Education in Africa, a Review of the Recommendations of the African Education Committee." The Crisis, XXXII (June, 1926), 86-89.

________. "If I Had a Million Dollars, a Review of the Phelps-Stokes Fund." The Crisis, XXXVIII (November, 1932), 347.

________. The Autobiography of W. E. B. Dubois. New York: International Publishers, 1968.

________. The Negro. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1915.

________, ed. The Negro Problem. New York: James Pott and Company, 1903.

Du Bois, W. E. B. The Souls of Black Folk. 4th ed. New York: Fawcett World Library, 1967.

________. "The Talented Tenth." The Negro Problem. New York: James Pott and Company, 1903.

________. "Thomas Jesse Jones." The Crisis, XXII (October, 1921), 253-256.

________. "Worlds of Color." Foreign Affairs, III, no. 3 (April, 1925), 423-444.

Eells, Walter Crosby. "Results of Surveys of Negro Colleges and Universities." Journal of Negro Education, IV (October, 1935), 476-481.

Elkins, Stanley M. Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life. 2nd ed. New York: The Universal Library, 1963.

Embree, Edwin. Brown America. New York: The Viking Press, 1931.

________, and Waxman, Julia. Investment in People. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1929.

Evans, Maurice. Black and White in the Southern States: A Study of the Race Problem in the United States from a South African Point of View. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1915.

"Fifth Annual Conference of the African Students Union." Tuskegee Student, XXXV (March, 1924), 4-6.

Firestone, Harvey S., Jr. The Romance and Drama of the Rubber Industry. Akron, n.p., 1932.

Foster, Philip. Education and Social Change in Ghana. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.

Franklin, John Hope. From Slavery to Freedom, A History of Negro Americans. 3rd ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.

Fraser, A. G. "The Real Function of the Prince of Wales College, Achimota." Elders West African Review, August, 1931, pp. 96-101.

The General Education Board, An Account of Its Activities, 1902-1914. New York: General Education Board, 1915.

Gossett, Thomas F. Race: The History of an Idea in America. New York: Schocken Books, 1965.

Grace, E. M. D. "Negro Education in America." Church Missionary Review, LXXVII (1926), 246-248.

Graham, Sonia. Mission and Government Education in Northern Nigeria, 1900-1919, with Special Reference to the Work of Hanns Vischer. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press, 1966.

Great Britain. Parliament. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 167 (1923).

Guggisberg, G. A Review of the Events of 1922-23. Accra: Government Printer, 1924.

Guggisberg, Sir G., and Fraser, A. G. The Future of the Negro. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1929.

Harlan, Louis R. Separate and Unequal: Public School Campaigns and Racism in the Southern Seaboard States, 1901-1915. New York: Atheneum, 1968.

Holmes, D. O. W. "Twenty-five Years of Thomas Jesse Jones and the Phelps-Stokes Fund." Journal of Negro Education, VII (October, 1938), 475-480.

Horrell, Muriel. A Decade of Bantu Education. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations, 1964.

Huberich, Charles H. The Political and Legislative History of Liberia. New York: Central Books Company, 1947.

The Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council, March 24-April 8, 1928. New York: International Missionary Council, 1928.

Johnson, James Weldon. Black Manhattan. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930.

Johnston, Sir Harry. The Story of My Life. London: Chatto and Windus, 1923.

Jones, Lance G. E. Negro Schools in the Southern States. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1928.

________. The Jeanes Teacher in the United States, 1908-1933. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1937.

Jones, Thomas Jesse. Educational Adaptations, Report of Ten Years' Work of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1910-1920. New York: Phelps-Stokes Fund, [1921].

________. Essentials of Civilization. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1929.

________. "Factors of a Program for Rural Missions." The Christian Mission in Relation to Rural Problems. London: International Missionary Council, 1928.

________. Four Essentials of Education. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

________. "Relation of Industrial Education to the Economic Progress of the South." The Southern Workman, XXXVIII (March, 1909), 139-144.

________. "Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum." The Southern Workman, XXXVI (January, 1907), 113-120.

________. "Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum: Economics and Material Welfare." The Southern Workman, XXXV (February, 1906), 111-116.

________. "The Rural Billions and the Agricultural Missions Foundation." New York: n.p., n.d.

Jones, Thomas Jesse. *The Sociology of a New York City Block.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1904.

Kellogg, Charles Flint. *NAACP, A History of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1967.

Keppel, Frederick P. "A Comment on Christian Missions in Africa." *The International Review of Missions*, October, 1929, pp. 503-508.

Knight, Wallace. *The Influence of Reconstruction on Education in the South.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1913.

Leavell, Ullin Whitney. *Philanthropy in Negro Education.* Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1930.

Lee, Gordon C., ed. *Crusade Against Ignorance, Thomas Jefferson on Education.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, 1961.

Lewis, L. J. *Education and Political Independence in Africa.* Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1962.

Leys, Norman. "Christianity and Race: A New Policy for Missions." *The Scots Observer* (Glasgow), November 13, 1926.

________. *Kenya.* London: The Hogarth Press, 1924.

________. To the Editor. *The Manchester Guardian*, October 26, 1926.

Logan, Rayford W. "The American Negro's View of Africa." *Africa Seen by American Negroes.* Edited by Alioune Diop. Paris: Presence Africain, 1958.

________. *The Negro in American Life and Thought: The Nadir, 1877-1901.* New York: The Dial Press, 1954.

Loram, Charles T. *The Education of the South African Native.* London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1917.

Loram, C. T. "The Phelps-Stokes Education Commission in South Africa." *The International Review of Missions*, October, 1921, pp. 496-508.

Ludlow, Helen W., ed. *Twenty-Two Years Work of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute. Records of Negro and Indian Graduates and Ex-Students.* Hampton: Normal School Press, 1893.

Lugard, F. D. *The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa.* Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, Ltd., 1922.

Lynch, Hollis. Edward Wilmot Blyden: Pan-African Patriot. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Mathews, Basil. Booker T. Washington, Educator and Interracial Interpreter. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948.

_______. "Education in Africa." Review of Education in Africa, by Thomas Jesse Jones. The Methodist Recorder, March 8, 1923.

_______. Roads to the City of God; a World Outlook from Jerusalem. London: Edinburgh House Press, 1929.

Meier, August. "The Beginning of Industrial Education in Negro Schools." The Midwest Journal, VII (Spring, 1955), 21-44.

_______. "The Vogue of Industrial Education." The Midwest Journal, VII (Fall, 1955), 241-266.

_______. Negro Thought in America, 1880-1915; Racial Ideologies in the Age of Booker T. Washington. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1966.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. The Maritime History of Massachusetts, 1783-1860. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1921.

Moton, R. R. "Education in Africa." Review of Education in Africa, by Thomas Jesse Jones. The International Review of Missions, January, 1923, pp. 128-133.

Murray, A. Victor. The School in the Bush. 2nd ed. London: Frank Cass and Company, 1967.

Myrdal, Gunnar. An American Dilemma. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Nyerere, Julius. The Arusha Declaration and TANU's Policy on Socialism and Self-Reliance. Dar Es Salaam: TANU's Publicity Section, 1967.

Oldham, J. H. "A Missionary Survey of the Year 1912." The International Review of Missions, January, 1913, pp. 47-59.

_______. "African Education: Missions and Government." The Scots Observer (Glasgow), December 11, 1926.

_______. "Kenya." Review of Kenya, by Norman Leys. The International Review of Missions, April, 1925, pp. 277-280.

Oldham, J. H. "Negro Education." Review of *Negro Education, A Survey of the Private and Higher Schools for Colored People in the United States*, by Thomas Jesse Jones, and *The Education of the South African Native*, by Charles T. Loram. *The International Review of Missions*, April, 1918, pp. 242-247.

________. "The Christian Mission in Africa as Seen at the International Conference at Le Zoute." *The International Review of Missions*, January, 1927, pp. 34-35.

________. "The Christian Opportunity in Africa. Some Reflections on the Report of the Phelps-Stokes Commission." *The International Review of Missions*, April, 1925, pp. 173-187.

________. "The School in the Bush." Review of *The School in the Bush*, by A. Victor Murray. *The International Review of Missions*, January, 1930, pp. 124-127.

________. To the Editor. *The Manchester Guardian*, October 29, 1926.

________. *White and Black in South Africa: A Critical Examination of the Rhodes Lectures of General Smuts*. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1930.

________, and Gollock, G. A., eds. "The Christian Mission in Africa." *The International Review of Missions*, July, 1926, pp. 323-611.

Park, Robert E. "The International Conference on the Negro." *The Southern Workman*, XLI (June, 1912), 347-352.

Parmalee, Julius H. "Freedman's Aid Societies, 1861-71." *Negro Education, A Survey of the Private and Higher Schools for Colored People in the United States*. Thomas Jesse Jones. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1917.

Paton, Alan. *South African Tragedy, The Life and Times of Jan Hofmeyr*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

Paton, William. "The Jerusalem Meeting--and After." *The International Review of Missions*, July, 1928, pp. 435-444.

Peabody, Francis G. *Education for Life: The Story of Hampton Institute*. New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1918.

Peirce, Paul S. *The Freedmen's Bureau, A Chapter in the History of Reconstruction*. Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa Press, 1904.

Perham, Margery. *Lugard, The Years of Authority, 1898-1945*. London: Collins, 1960.

*Proceedings of the General Missionary Conference of Northern Rhodesia.* Lovedale: Lovedale Institute Press, 1925.

*Proceedings of the John F. Slater Fund for the Education of Freedmen, 1882.* Baltimore: n.p.

*Proceedings of the John F. Slater Fund for the Education of Freedmen, 1883.* Baltimore: n.p.

*Proceedings of the John F. Slater Fund for the Education of Freedmen, 1888.* Baltimore: n.p.

*Proceedings of the Second Capon Springs Conference for Education in the South, 1899.* Capon Springs: n.p., 1899.

*Proceedings of the Trustees of the Peabody Education Fund, 1867-1914.* 3 vols. Boston: Press of John Wilson and Son, 1875-1888.

Ranger, T. O. "African Attempts to Control Education in East and Central Africa, 1900-1939." *Past and Present*, XXXII (December, 1965), 64-87.

Rice, Jessie Pearl. *J. L. M. Curry; Southerner, Statesman and Educator.* New York: King's Crown Press, 1949.

Rosberg, Carl G., Jr., and Nottingham, John. *The Myth of Mau Mau: Nationalism in Kenya.* New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966.

Rotberg, Robert I. *Christian Missions and the Creation of Northern Rhodesia, 1880-1924.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Saville, H. "African Characteristics." *The Southern Workman*, LIV (September, 1925), 75-78.

Scanlon, David G., ed. *Church, State, and Education in Africa.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1966.

Scott, H. S. "The Development of the African in Relation to Western Contact." *Yearbook of Education, 1938.* London: Evans Brothers, 1938, pp. 693-739.

Seifman, Eli. "A History of the New York State Colonization Society." New York: Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1966.

Sheperd, Robert H. *Lovedale, South Africa.* Lovedale: The Lovedale Press, 1940.

Shepperson, George. "External Factors in the Development of African Nationalism, with Particular Relevance to British Central Africa." *Phylon*, XXII (1961), 207-225.

________. "Notes on Negro American Influences on the Emergence of African Nationalism." *Journal of African History*, I (1960), 299-312.

________, and Price, Thomas. *Independent African*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1958.

Sibley, James L., and Westermann D. *Liberia--Old and New*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Doram and Company, 1928.

Sithole, Ndabaningi. *African Nationalism*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Smith, Edwin W. *Aggrey of Africa, A Study in Black and White*. London: Student Christian Movement, 1929.

________. *The Christian Mission in Africa; A Study Based on the Proceedings of the International Conference at Le Zoute, Belgium, September 14 to 21, 1926*. London: The International Missionary Council, 1926.

________. *The Life and Times of Daniel Lindley, 1801-1880*. London: The Epworth Press, 1949.

Spencer, Samuel R., Jr. *Booker T. Washington and the Negro's Place in American Life*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1955.

The Stabilization Fund of the Commission on Interracial Cooperation. *A Sane Approach to the Race Problem*. New York: Commission on Interracial Cooperation, 1930.

Staudenraus, P. J. *The African Colonization Movement, 1816-1865*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

Stokes, Anson Phelps. *A Brief Biography of Booker Washington*. Hampton: Hampton Institute Press, 1936.

________. *Art and the Color Line*. Washington: n.p., 1939.

________. *Report on Education, Native Welfare and Race Relations in East and South Africa*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1934.

Stokes, Anson Phelps. *Stokes Records; Notes Regarding the Ancestry and Lives of Anson Phelps Stokes and Helen Louisa (Phelps) Stokes.* Vol. I. New York: Privately printed for the Family, 1910.

________. *Tuskegee Institute--The First Fifty Years*. Tuskegee: Tuskegee Institute Press, 1931.

________, ed. *Progress in Negro Status and Race Relations in the United States, 1911-1946. The Thirty-five Year Report of the Phelps-Stokes Fund*. New York: n.p., 1948.

Swint, Henry L. *The Northern Teacher in the South, 1862-1870*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1941.

Talbot, Edith Armstrong. *Samuel Chapman Armstrong, A Biographical Study*. New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1904.

Thompson, C. H. "Education in Africa." Review of *Education in Africa*, by Thomas Jesse Jones. *Opportunity, A Journal of Negro Life*, I (June, 1923), 28-29.

Torrence, Ridgeley. *The Story of John Hope*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948.

Vischer, Hanns. "Some Aspects of African Education." *Church Missionary Review*, LXXVI (1925), 47-51.

Ward, W. E. F. *Fraser of Trinity and Achimota*. London: The Ghana Universities Press, 1965.

Washington, Booker T. "Industrial Education for the Negro." *The Negro Problem*. W. E. B. Du Bois. New York: James Pott and Company, 1903.

________. *Up from Slavery*. 7th ed. New York: Bantam Books, 1963.

Williams, C. Kingsley. *Achimota--The Early Years, 1924-1928*. Accra: Longmans, 1962.

Wilson, John. *Education and Changing West African Culture*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, 1963.

Wilson, P. W. "America Discovers South Africa." *The World's Work*, L (September, 1925), 535-547.

________. "Education in Africa." Review of *Education in Africa*, by Thomas Jesse Jones. *The New York Times Book Review*, December 24, 1922.

Wood, L. Hollingsworth. "The Phelps-Stokes Fund." Opportunity, Journal of Negro Life, X (October, 1932), 32-38.

Woodson, Carter G. "Progress in Negro Status and Race Relations, 1911-1946, the Thirty Year Report of the Phelps-Stokes Fund." The Journal of Negro History, XXXIV (1949), 368-369.

________. The History of the Negro Church. Washington, D.C.: The Associated Publishers, 1921.

________. The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861. New York: G. P. Putnam, 1915.

________. "Thomas Jesse Jones." The Journal of Negro History, XXXV (1950), 107-109.

________. To the Editor. The Afro-American, June 3, 1936.

Woodward, C. Vann. The Strange Career of Jim Crow. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.

Woofter, Thomas J. The Basis of Racial Adjustment. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1925.

________. Black Yeomanry. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1930.

Work, Monroe N. Negro Year Book, 1928-1929. Tuskegee: Tuskegee Institute Press, 1929.

World Missionary Conference, 1910, Report of the Commission. New York: Thomas H. Revell Company, n.d.

Wraith, R. E. Guggisberg. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Wright, Arthur D., and Redcay, E. R. The Negro Rural School Fund, Inc. (Anna T. Jeanes Foundation) 1907-1933. Washington, D.C.: The Negro Rural School Fund, Inc., 1933.

Yates. T. J. A. "Essentials of Civilization." Review of Essentials of Civilization, by Thomas Jesse Jones. Africa, III (1930), 129-130.

## Newspapers

Die Vaterland, January 22, 1935.

Gold Coast Leader, February 16, 1924.

Gold Coast Times, February 16, 1924.

Natal Adviser, April 17, 1931.

The Argus, June 17, 1931.

The Rand Daily Mail, May 4, 1931.

The Salt Lake Evening Telegram, July 10, 1913.

## Unpublished Theses

Carson, Suzanne C. "Samuel Chapman Armstrong: Missionary to the South." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, 1952.

Carter, Felice. "Education in Uganda, 1894-1945." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1967.

Heyman, Richard D. "The Role of the Carnegie Corporation of New York in African Education, 1925-1960." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1969.

Kalibala, Ernest. "Education for Villages in Uganda, East Africa." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1934.

King, Kenneth J. "The American Negro Background of the Phelps-Stokes Commissions and Their Influence on Education in East Africa, Especially in Kenya." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1968.

Pfanner, Daniel J. "The Thought of Negro Educators in Negro Higher Education, 1900-1950." Unpublished Ed.D. report, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1957.

Yates, Barbara. "The Missions and Educational Development in Belgian Africa." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1967.